

THE LONDON REVIEW

OF

Politics, Society, Literature, Art, & Science.

No. 137.—VOL. VI.]

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1863.

[PRICE 4d.
Unstamped.]

The Country's Ministerial Needs.
The Prussian Dead-lock.
Lord Llanover again.
The French Assembly.
Private Bill Legislation.
The Throne of Greece.

Moral Power in Politics.
Breach of Promise of Marriage.
Blue Jackets and Steam Jackets.
Dutch Notes.
Lord Wrottesley on Charities.
English Comfort.
The Past Week.

REVIEWS:—

Farrar's Bampton Lectures.
Lord Stanhope's Miscellanies.
Aurora Floyd.
The Bishop of Exeter.
A Female Ragged School in Egypt.
Short Notices.

ART AND SCIENCE:—

Music.
Contemporary Science.
The Simonides MSS.—Discussion at the Royal Society of Literature.
List of Meetings.
List of New Books.

THE COUNTRY'S MINISTERIAL NEEDS.

THE political requirements of the country change faster than its political ideas. The tactics and traditions of party long survive the circumstances which gave them their origin and meaning. Parliamentary combatants range themselves, session after session, in the same battle array as they used to do in their youth, use pretty much the same watchwords, and fight as far as they can under the same banners and in the name of the same principles, though the contest has long been over and the victory has long ago been won; though the watchwords have degenerated into dreary commonplaces, and the principles have been irrevocably settled. This necessarily introduces a certain mischievous element of insincerity into all the struggles and strategy of St. Stephen's, gives to party a nasty taste of faction, and too often replaces combats by intrigues.

But this is not all. The country at large has as little realized the change which has come over the spirit of its dream, as the Senators whom it sends up to represent it. Men still seem to fancy that there are grand political doctrines to be contended for, grand patriotic objects, as to which statesmen are divided, grand legislative achievements still needed, which have to be fought for as well as to be wrought out. Consequently, in their elections they strive to choose candidates who think as they do,—or rather who belong to the set or party that used to think as they do,—forgetting that now nearly all those who think at all, think very much alike. Conservatives choose a Tory—or one who has the reputation of deserving that time-honoured but somewhat vague appellation—in assumed or real ignorance of the fact that now-a-days the Whigs are just as conservative as the Tories, and that free trade, a free press, retrenchment and reform, are as much a part of the Tory creed, or the Tory profession, as of that of their antagonists. But there is more even than this to be admitted and recorded, before we can be conscious of our actual position and our true requirements. On nearly all questions of home or foreign policy,—on all questions that are not merely matter of administration, of means, and of moments,—the mass of the people not only think very unanimously, but they think pretty clearly and decidedly; and such is their despotic authority when they do so, that whatever Ministry is in power must, even in its own despite, give effect to and virtually adopt the policy of the country. The practical points for electors to determine, therefore, are really narrowed to these two—whether they will have their purposes carried out by men who share them, or by men who only accept them—by conscientious servants, or by zealous associates; and whether they will confide them to skilful men, either party friends or party foes, or to party

friends, either skilful or the contrary. Statesmen and Ministers, whether Conservative or Liberal, have to consider not so much what policy they will carry out, as by what means, at what rate, and in what spirit, cordial or lukewarm, they will carry it out. Thus, whatever Government was in power would equally find itself compelled, and would probably be nearly equally disposed, to maintain the defensive strength of the country, and perhaps to complete its system of fortifications, though Lord Palmerston would do so *con amore*, and his successor with less zeal and fervour. Every Chancellor of the Exchequer would be under an equal pressure to unfetter trade and reduce taxation, though Mr. Gladstone might do it restlessly and boldly, Mr. Disraeli ingeniously, dodgily, and “*catchpennily*,” and Sir Cornwall Lewis cautiously and quietly. Any Foreign Secretary, whatever his private predilections, would be equally under the necessity of upholding the Italian cause with energy and spirit; but Lord Derby and Lord Malmesbury would do it in one fashion, and Lord Palmerston and Earl Russell in another.

There is, however, an exception to be noted to the general unanimity of the country. There are three small sections of politicians who have their own special notions and do not share the common sentiment of the British people. There is the Irish Brigade, who, caring little about general principles of any sort, are bent upon Galway jobs because they are Irishmen, and are hostile to Italian unity because they are Papists. There are the thoughtful, generous, and cultivated Radicals, represented by Mr. Forster and Mr. Stansfield, who are inclined to economy and to democracy; but who would not purchase the first by any derogation from the national honour or the European influence of England, nor assist the second to place the intellect under the feet of the ignorance of the people. Lastly, there are Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden, personally powerful, without influence at present on public affairs, because they have chosen to sever themselves from all sympathy with the sound heart of the nation, but who may at any moment become once more controllers of the destinies of their country, whenever they accidentally fall into harmony with the popular feeling of the hour, or whenever their fits and the people's fits of parsimony may chance to synchronise. The numerical strength of these three sections would not be in itself formidable even when united, and union between them would appear to be a thing almost impossible; but in the present nearly balanced numbers of the two great parties, who alone are the real competitors for office, the support of any one of these sections might, on a critical night, decide the victory, and the temptations to purchase that support by unworthy and dangerous compliances may, therefore, be overpowering.

Now, such being the state of affairs, what sort of Ministers

does the nation want, and what qualities would it be wise to look for in those to whom it entrusts the management of its concerns—the right to do its work, to wield its strength, to speak in its name? Clearly, it wants hearty, capable, and honest men—whatever their shade of opinion, whatever the *nuance* of their party connections. To meet this three-fold need there can be no doubt that, as a whole, the present Government is far better adapted than any that can succeed it; and therefore, notwithstanding local losses and casual indignation, we think Lord Palmerston will remain in power, and we are certain that he ought. He is undeniably hearty in that cause in which at this moment England is more interested than any other—the cause of Italy; and his Foreign Secretary is yet more earnest and single-minded than himself. If Lord Malmesbury and Mr. Disraeli came into power to-morrow, they would abide by old engagements, they would proclaim the old policy, they would write despatches speaking apparently the same language as their predecessors; but the spirit would be different; the *tone*, therefore, could scarcely be identical; and, at all events, we know well that the mere advent to power of statesmen who, though they expressed the national wishes, did not share the national sentiment, would give secret strength and courage to the enemies of Italy, would encourage the reactionary appetencies of Austria, might retard for long the evacuation of Rome, and by deluding one set of men and disheartening others, might even lead to the renewal of hostilities, which a little longer continuance of a firm and cordial friendship in the high places of England would soon have made impossible or hopeless.

As to ability, there can be no comparison instituted between the actual holders of office and the expectants. Experience, as well as talent, is all on the side of the *Ins*. We are no thorough-going supporters of the Government *en masse*, as our readers well know. Against the Home Office and the India House we have often been forced to bear testimony—to cry aloud and spare not. With the exceptions of Lord Derby and his son, there is no commanding ability of any sort in the Conservative ranks; and, eloquent and sensible and wonderfully clever as he is, administrative skill is not Lord Derby's *forte*. There is no one among the Opposition statesmen who, for sound, cool, critical judgment, capacity for work, unimpressible and imperturbable sobriety of mind, can be named along with Sir G. C. Lewis; nor can any one look without dismay on the possible substitution of Mr. Disraeli for Mr. Gladstone at the head of the finances of the country. The one keeps the commercial world sometimes in a mischievous and irritating fever of expectation and suspense; but the appointment of the other would be the signal for indefinite and dangerous alarm. Mr. Gladstone has too active and restless a mind to be a perfect Chancellor of the Exchequer; but his integrity and genius are above all question; and no one feels any confidence either that Mr. Disraeli would see what was wise, or that some political stratagem or fancied party gain would not divert him from doing it when seen. And no one who considers how many hundred actions and decisions a Minister must inaugurate in the privacy of his office, for one which comes before the public or is made the subject of parliamentary discussion, will be disinclined to place administrative capacity and judgment in the very foremost rank of Ministerial qualifications.

As to honesty,—of course all British statesmen are honest in one sense. But the honesty which we refer to now as of special obligation and importance, is that political integrity of purpose and of resolution which withholds a Minister from purchasing the aid or alliance of "free lances" or floating sections of the Parliamentary world, on occasions of critical conflict, by concessions which he knows to be dangerous, or measures which his conscience disapproves. The necessity of compromise in a Government by party, such as ours, and, indeed, in all free states, we fully admit; but there are compromises of which the benefit is momentary and the evil enduring and irrecoverable. And when parties are evenly balanced, the least want of political honesty in either may virtually hand over the direction of the policy of the country, and sometimes even the decision of its destiny, to a small knot of men who love their country far less than their crotchets, and whose sight is even feebler than their love. We have already incurred this danger and this suffering more than once. Now, few can contemplate the relative position of the Government and the Conservative party without seeing which party will lie under the

greatest temptation to yield to the unworthy barter we are describing. And no man who remembers the character of the leaders of that party and their antecedent acts, will doubt on which side of the House that sort of temptation will be most readily succumbed to.

THE PRUSSIAN DEAD-LOCK.

"NON POSSUMUS" is clearly the order of the day on the Continent. The note of defiance which has been bandied to and fro between Rome and Turin, to the discomfiture of the French Emperor and M. Drouyn de Lhuys, is now caught up and re-echoed at Berlin. "Non possumus!" shouts the King of Prussia, clutching probably at a hazy notion that, by virtue of Divine right, he shares the infallibility of the Vicar of Christ; and a very resolute "non possumus" comes back to him from the Lower Chamber of his Parliament. There is now, therefore, an absolute dead-lock in the Government of Prussia; and before it can resume its normal and constitutional action, either the King and his Ministry, or the House of Deputies, must abandon their present attitude. But neither side as yet seems disposed to abate one jot or tittle of its claims and pretensions. "It will be the aim of the Government," says the King's latest utterance, "firmly to maintain the position which it has taken up, at the same time remaining open to any approaches which may be made by the Chamber of Deputies, with the view of increasing the greatness of Prussia through her military power." Equally firm and explicit are the declarations of the Deputies. "One or the other side must give way," exclaimed Herr Twesten, amid tremendous applause, "and the Chamber will not yield—no, not though the Constitution itself should fall." The slow, tranquil spirit of the Prussians has at last been thoroughly roused by the stupid obstinacy of the King and the outrageous insolence of his first Minister. Every move in the game now must be momentous in its consequences to the future of Prussia. Things have now gone too far for the Deputies to recede without bringing upon themselves the scorn of foreign nations, and the loss of all true liberty at home. Smooth and easy is the downward path that leads to despotism; and the Prussians know what measure of forbearance M. Bismarck will mete out to them, if they let him remain master of the field.

The struggle between the Crown and the Chamber of Deputies is now just a year old. In the early part of last year, it will be remembered, the Prussian Deputies, having taken a hint from M. Fould's famous report to the Emperor, required a more detailed specification of the charges for which provision was made in the budget; but the Government resisted, and prevailed upon the King to dissolve Parliament. The country returned a House of Representatives more hostile to the Government than the preceding one had been; and in the autumn of last year the Ministerial budget for 1862 was thrown out in the Lower House, as making provision for a large increase of military expenditure which had been incurred without the sanction of the people's representatives. A budget, smaller than the one brought forward by the Government, was accordingly voted, whereupon some of the Ministry resigned, and M. Bismarck became Premier. The budget voted by the Lower House then went to the Upper House, who threw it out on the ground that it was insufficient, and voted the budget originally proposed by the Government. Thereupon the Lower House passed a unanimous resolution declaring that the Upper House had violated the constitution, inasmuch as, not confining itself to adopting or rejecting the budget voted by the Chamber of Deputies after the rejection of the Minister's budget, "it adopted the budget project of the Government, which did not come under its powers at all; that consequently that resolution was null and without value, and the Royal Government could not derive any right therefrom." For this declaration the session was forthwith closed, and the Deputies were dismissed to their homes; but in the course of the session the budget for 1863 had also been brought forward and then withdrawn, when the Government saw that there was no hope of its passing. During the recess, fresh fuel was daily added to the flame. It was the plain interest of the Government to suffer angry passions to cool, but this did not suit the bitter and haughty nature of M. Bismarck. The people were assiduously goaded into a fury by the constant seizures and persecutions of the Liberal press, the King's ludicrous harangues to absolutist deputations, and the lan-

guage of insolent defiance hurled at the people by the organs of the Court party. When Parliament, therefore, met again last month, the Deputies were in a very savage mood; but they have fought their battle in the present session with admirable temper, firmness, and discretion.

The address of the Deputies, which the King has been childish enough to have sent to him through the post, combines perfect respect for the King himself with the most sweeping denunciation of his Ministers. The previous session, it says, has closed without the budgets for 1862 and 1863 being passed within the period prescribed by the Constitution; and "since then the Ministers appointed by your Majesty have, in opposition to the Constitution, carried on the administration without a legal budget, and also, disregarding an express declaration of the Chamber, have incurred expenditure which that Chamber had definitely and explicitly refused." To this the King replies that there has been no violation of the Constitution, inasmuch as an occasion has arisen for which the Constitution makes no provision. The Constitution requires, it is true, the assent of the King and both Chambers to all loans and budgets; but the Chamber of Deputies has obstinately withheld its assent from the Government budget, and therefore, according to the royal logic, the Government has been compelled to carry on the administration without a legal budget, and it means, of course, "to wield public affairs outside the conditions prescribed by the Constitution," until such time as the representatives of the Prussian people have descended to the degrading level of French Deputies, and have learnt to vote all that is required of them with obsequious alacrity.

Such men, however, as the King of Prussia and M. Bismarck are, after all, not very formidable opponents, for they are quite incapable of masking their designs. Though M. Bismarck is a devout admirer of Louis Napoleon, he has not yet learnt the mere rudiments of the Napoleonic system. The art of saying one thing and meaning another, of disguising despotism under the garb of liberty, and of "strangling a nation in the night-time with a thing called a plébiscite," he does not seem so much as to have heard of. He blurts the whole truth out at once. His theory of the "hiatus" in the Constitution, and the consequent necessity for carrying on the administration without a legal budget, strikes an open blow at the very root of constitutional government—namely, the right of the people's representatives to control the public expenditure. According to this theory, the Ministers can at any time make themselves absolute masters of the public purse by bringing forward an extravagant budget, certain of rejection in the Chamber of Deputies. The broad, simple issue, therefore, of the present struggle amounts to this,—shall constitutional government, as it is understood in England, or virtual absolutism, be established in Prussia? M. Bismarck takes no pains to conceal his contempt for our Constitution. "The English Ministry," he says, "call it what you will, is only the Ministry of Parliament, but we are the Ministers of the King. The House of Hohenzollern is not yet ripe to become a mere ornament of your constitutional edifice, or a mere part of a machine in the mechanism of the parliamentary regimen." But constitutional government in its fullness we will have, reply the Deputies. Where the Ministers and Parliament cannot agree, the constitutional remedy is a dissolution, and the appeal to the country must be final; in other words, the days of right divine have passed away for ever, and the will of the people reigns supreme in its stead. Such, then, are the objects of the present conflict between the Prussian King and his Parliament. The whole gains of previous political developments, as the Deputies remarked in their address, are now called in question. If they are worsted now, they will very soon have despotism back again at their doors; but they are evidently alive to the gravity of the crisis, and give no sign of flinching. Their eyes are steadily fixed on one mark; and there is no mistaking what they mean, when they tell the King that stirring foreign complications is not the way to heal internal discord, and that not until constitutional government has been re-established at home, will Prussia exercise her legitimate influence abroad.

With the King beyond all others lies the responsibility for the present state of affairs. His darling project, the re-organization of the army, was at first supported by the Chamber of Deputies; and if they support it no longer, the King has only to thank his own obstinacy in forcing unpopular Ministries upon them. He refuses to bow his stiff neck to the constitutional principle of choosing Ministers

whose opinions are in harmony with the national will. So recently as last autumn Baron Vincke and Herr Twisten, eminent leaders of the Liberal party, gave their support to the Government budget, but now they have been driven into the most determined opposition. All differences in the Liberal party have been effectually healed by M. Bismarck, and it meets him with a compact front. Had the King last year accepted a Liberal Ministry with a good grace, all would have been well now, and he would probably have been allowed to carry out his military reforms without hindrance; but he took M. Bismarck for his chief counsellor, and such an appointment at such a time was an insult and a challenge to the people, which they have not been slow to take up. He listens only to the voice of a clique of the most narrow-minded, bigoted, and insolent aristocracy that cumber the face of the earth,—men who tell him that his relation to the Constitution is that of Christ to his Apostles, and that his contest with the Chamber of Deputies is the fight of Christ and Antichrist; and thus he has driven his subjects fairly to bay. He has placed himself in a position where Liberal Europe is eagerly looking for his signal defeat and humiliation.

LORD LLANOVER AGAIN.

WE had hoped that we had heard the last of Lord Llanover, and of the discreditable squabbles in which his lordship is eternally engaged with his unlucky subjects in Monmouthshire. We had hoped that the conversation which took place in the House of Commons, in June, 1862, respecting the Herberts of Clytha and their change of name, would have convinced his lordship that the law, as it stands, is dead against his view of the case in question; that, at present, every Englishman has a right to assume and bear any name he pleases, with or without Royal Licence; and that a Royal Licence is but the recognition, in the highest quarter, of an act already accomplished. We do not dispute that this law may be defective and objectionable; that it may be fairly considered desirable that some check and order should be imposed by the Legislature on the indiscriminate and wanton assumption by *roturiers* of noble names; and that Lord Llanover may with justice plead that,—as he has made the name of Hall illustrious by his Radical struggles in Marylebone, and by the various pitched battles, which he has fought with a variety of Welsh insurgents, since he has been raised to the dignity of Lord-Lieutenant of Monmouthshire,—he has acquired a vested and exclusive interest in that name, and is entitled to claim that no inglorious Smith or Brown shall intrude upon it. But then it rests with his lordship to propose and carry through Parliament a new law to this effect; for at present, as we have already said, no such law exists; and Englishmen can only be expected to observe the laws of their country as they are, and not as Lord Llanover is of opinion that they ought to be.

The question between his lordship and the Herberts of Clytha, is a very narrow one. Lord Llanover's own son-in-law, Mr. Herbert (late Jones), of Llanarth, is first-cousin to Mr. Herbert, of Clytha, and himself assumed the surname of Herbert, in 1848, by Royal Licence. The claims of the two families of Llanarth and Clytha to that name, whether valid or invalid, are precisely alike. The only grievance under which Lord Llanover, therefore, suffers is, that in the Clytha case the name of Herbert has been assumed *without* a Royal Licence. This fact appears to be intolerable to his lordship. He considers it as "disrespectful to the Queen;" as "casting scorn upon the sovereign's approval" of the change of name in question; as "unworthy a member of the untitled aristocracy;" as indicative of "ultra-Liberal and democratic tendencies;" as a proof of "pride and vanity, which always tend to rankness."

Recollections of the great days of the Marylebone Vestry may possibly raise a smile on the lips of those who have not forgotten the style of ladder by which a certain Benjamin Hall raised himself to the peerage, and which that worthy has since kicked down. But that *honores mutant mores* is a trite adage, and we will not pain the aristocratic Lord-Lieutenant of Monmouthshire by dilating upon it at present. In order to punish the delinquents of Clytha for their "ultra-Liberal and Democratic" proceedings, Lord Llanover is now straining his official powers of Lord-Lieutenant to the utmost. He has excluded them from the Magisterial bench and the Militia; he has gibbeted them

and the ladies of their family in the local press; he has actually condescended to act as *amateur* policeman to the Lord Chamberlain, and has warned that official against his own near connections as impostors likely to intrude improperly into the presence of the Sovereign; and this species of persecution he has continued up to the present moment; having, within the last few weeks, warned the members of the Association for the Preservation of the River Usk, that if they dare to admit Mr. Herbert of Clytha as a member of their body, he, their Chairman, will instantly withdraw his name and support. And all this, simply and solely because the Herberts of Clytha have assumed the name which they bear without the sanction of a Royal Licence.

The contest between the two parties is apparently an unequal one. Mr. Herbert, of Clytha, is a quiet country gentleman, unaccustomed to the "rough and tumble" of political squabbles; distressed at the notoriety thus forced upon him, and in no way able to compete in such a vulgar conflict with the *quondam* "Pet" of the Radicals of Marylebone. He enjoys no access to the backstairs of the Home Office, or to the *boudoirs* of the wives of Cabinet Ministers; nor has he any opportunities of privily earwiggling the Lord Chancellor, or of button-holding the Lord Chamberlain. His only advantage is that he has got the law and public opinion on his side; and we venture to predict that with such powerful auxiliaries he will ultimately make good his case.

As an example of the injustice of the persecution to which this Welsh gentleman is being so unworthily subjected, we will adduce a well-known instance of the assumption of a name not only without, but in spite of a Royal Licence, to which no Lord-Lieutenant, Lord Chancellor, or Lord Chamberlain has taken exception. In 1836, Mr. Robert Adam Dundas assumed, by Royal Licence, the surname of Christopher *only*, dropping his original name, such being the condition of a will by which he inherited a large estate. In 1852, Mr. Christopher, who had sat for many years in Parliament under that name, was made a Privy Councillor, and took office in Lord Derby's Government. But in 1855, without obtaining the revocation of the licence granted to him in 1836, or the concession of a fresh licence, Mr. Christopher assumed, *proprio motu*, the additional surnames of Hamilton Nisbet. As Mr. Nisbet, his name appears on the roll of Privy Councillors of that date, and as Mr. Nisbet he voted in Parliament up to 1857. In 1857 Mr. Nisbet once more, without Royal Licence, altered his name, and assumed the final surname of Hamilton, and as the Right Hon. R. A. C. N. Hamilton his name now stands on the roll of the Privy Council and on the list of Magistrates for Lincolnshire.

Now if Mr. R. A. C. N. Hamilton, a Privy Councillor, a Member of Parliament, and a Justice of the Peace, may act thus; why may not Mr. Herbert, of Clytha—nay, why may not poor Mr. Buggy, of Bedford, at a humble distance, follow his example unmolested by the Llanovers of society? It is clear, from this Dundas-Christopher-Nisbet-Hamilton case, that a Royal Licence does not either confer a name, or even imply a Royal command that the individual obtaining it shall be known by any particular name; for, if it did, Mr. Christopher would be Mr. Christopher still, and would not be—as he is—either Mr. Nisbet or Mr. Hamilton, or both. It is clear from it that a change of name, *proprio motu*, does not necessarily exclude a man from the Privy Council or the Magisterial bench, for if it did, neither Mr. Nisbet nor Mr. Hamilton would have enjoyed, as they have done, either of those dignities; and it is equally clear from it that every Englishman has a right to adopt whatever name is most convenient to him, and that he ought not to be subjected to official persecution for having exercised what is and will unquestionably continue to be his legal right, until "the Llanover Act" to the contrary has been brought in and passed through both Houses of Parliament.

We will, in conclusion, say a few words on behalf of a more humble class of persons, who are also deeply concerned in the question which Lord Llanover has so unnecessarily and offensively raised—we mean the class to which Mr. Buggy, of Bedford, belongs,—obscure men whom accident or malice has invested with ridiculous or indecent surnames, who find those surnames distressing and detrimental to them in their progress through life, and who, therefore, seek to avoid them. Mr. Buggy, to judge from his letter to the *Times*, is actuated by no ambitious or aggressive motives; he claims no affinity to the ancient and noble family of Stanhope, as,

without any great stretch of imagination, he might do. He modestly asks to be allowed to escape from his present designation and to take refuge in his mother's maiden name, Newman. But as he holds a public situation, it is clear that he cannot do this, without running the risk of considerable annoyance should he have the ill-fortune to meet with a Bedfordshire Llanover, who would, of course, amiably improve the opportunity of holding up—under the pretence of discharging an important public duty—the humble-minded Mr. Buggy to the derision and execration of his fellow men as a social delinquent of the deepest dye. It appears to us to be a serious evil that any uncertainty should exist, as to what relief a man may legally claim when circumstanced as Mr. Buggy states himself to be, and a still more serious evil that high public officials should condescend—as we fear the Home Secretary and the Lord Chancellor have done in the Clytha case—to connive at the persecution by their subordinates of individuals exercising their indisputable legal rights.

It is a favourite argument with neo-aristocrats of the Llanover class, that men seeking to change their surnames must be invariably impostors, unworthy of all consideration. To this it may be replied, that many members of the House of Lords have not disdained to resort to such a measure; and that whenever any of their lordships' daughters marry men bearing unpleasant or indecent names, the happy bridegrooms are speedily Normanized, by Royal Licences, into De Mowbrays, De Horsays, De Frevilles, De Burghs, and the like. One instance occurs to us of a change of name effected worthily, for an obvious and reasonable purpose, by one of the foremost Englishmen of the present day, which is so germane to Mr. Buggy's dilemma, that with a sketch of the circumstances under which it was effected we shall conclude our article.

About forty years ago a young Etonian of extraordinary promise used to be grievously persecuted by the idlers and the ribalds of the school, who had invented an obvious and abominably obscene paraphrase of his surname. The boy grew up to man's estate, and more than fulfilled the promise of his youth. Entering Parliament, and speedily acquiring in that assembly influence and consideration, one of his first acts was to obtain for himself and all his family a Royal Licence to drop a single letter in his name, by which slight alteration the atrocious jest under which he had so often blushed when an innocent child was deprived of its sting.

We have not mentioned the name of the distinguished statesman to whom we allude, because we do not, in the discharge of our public duties, take that odious delight in inflicting pain upon individuals which appears to characterize Lord Llanover's public proceedings in Wales. That this story is true may be easily ascertained by anybody who chooses to inquire; and we conceive that the public has a right to know, if an embryo Cabinet Minister may act thus, why, *pace* Lord Llanover and his allies at the Herald's Office, Mr. Alfred Buggy, of Bedford, actuated by precisely the same motives, may not go and do likewise without being exposed to the *peine forte et dure* of his Lordship's displeasure?

THE FRENCH ASSEMBLY.

THE discussions in the French Senate close—as they usually close—with the triumph of the Emperor's Government. "Rien n'est plus docile au fond," says M. About, "que les Assemblées." M. Ollivier and M. Jules Favre spoke in vain; for they spoke to a body of listeners who worship the powers that be with almost Oriental unanimity. The entire Corps Legislatif seldom bow the knee to any but one idol, and arguments, sarcasm, arithmetic, were thrown away upon them. The more M. Ollivier demanded an increase of liberty, the more they applauded the resolute Minister who, upon this occasion, unhesitatingly maintained that liberty was an apple from a forbidden tree. M. Jules Favre proved conclusively the nature of French intervention in Mexico; but he had to sit down silenced by the uproar which his words provoked. M. Baroche and M. Billault had easy tasks. They rose after "the Opposition orators, as the sun arises after a storm. Never were the mouthpieces of the Emperor's closet more grand, more successful, or more impressive. They did not stay to deal with figures, but soared at once to generalities. During their respective speeches they seldom sank below

the destinies of France, her mission, and her sensitiveness where the honour of her flag is concerned. It was not to be wondered at, if they carried the Assembly with them.

There can be no question that the French Empire and constitutional liberty are hardly compatible. M. Baroche can scarcely be blamed as imprudent for seeming to admit a truth so incontrovertible. The French Emperor himself, who repeatedly promises that France some day shall be free, never has gone so far as to maintain with that voice of impassible irony to which Europe is accustomed, that France actually is free at present. The recent debate in every single point affords conclusive evidence that the French Cabinet are not restrained by any decent modesty from telling their countrymen that Frenchmen, as a nation, are unfit to be left to themselves. It is scarcely more than a fortnight since M. de la Guéronnière informed Paris, through the medium of his journal, that Government interference in the elections was a constitutional measure, and much to be desired. The French Minister in the discussion on the address has openly and ostentatiously endorsed the insolent falsehood. In the same manner it is now announced that the press will not be allowed to outstep the limits laid down for it by a jealous and tyrannical executive. The question naturally arises, has France no feeling of indignation at hearing the policy of reactionism at home so audaciously put forward by the Tuileries? It seems, in truth, that France cares very little about the matter. The Emperor has managed by an ancient and useful stratagem to make the French utterly indifferent to freedom of election and the liberty of the press. He thinks, with reason, that he may hold the Paris press and the Corps Legislatif in the hollow of his hand, provided he is clever enough to degrade both in the eyes of France. The French Representatives are a body who confine themselves closely to the glorious duty of voting as they are told, and sounding the praises of their sovereign; what does it signify to the French nation how they are elected? The Paris journals—even the most disaffected—are only dissatisfied and discontented echoes of the *Moniteur*. Their fellow-subjects have little interest in what befalls them, and are ready to leave them to their fate. The journalists of France are not France in any sense of the word, but are merely a French coterie, and the gross acts of injustice which they have to suffer daily are lightly regarded by the world at large. The declamations of the lovers of liberty in the Corps Legislatif have produced a singular result. The cords which bind the press have been drawn a little tighter in consequence. In the pride and flush of conscious power, the Government answers all criticism by a home-thrust. An official admonition has been issued to remind all the newspapers of the capital that it is against French law to publish in their columns summaries of the discussion in the House. They may content themselves henceforward with the official *procès verbal*, served out to them under the supervision of the Executive. To this repressive and severe measure they submit with suppressed indignation. How insulting and annoying is the restriction, may be gathered from the fact that M. Emile de Girardin, who, in virtue of his talent, stands first among the Imperial writers of the day, has turned restive, and has determined to brave the terrors of the law. The mass of his fellow-citizens are not interested in the contest. They know that they cannot have the Empire and liberty at once, and for the present they have chosen the Empire. They accept its disadvantages, for the sake of what they imagine to be its benefits.

When, therefore, in replying to the figures of M. Jules Favre, and the sarcasm of the other Opposition speeches, the Minister contented himself with a burst of eloquence about the mission of France, he was neither illogical nor inconsequent. We are not free, say the Opposition. The Empire is great and glorious, replies the Minister. France complains now and then of the price she has to pay, and it is a natural rejoinder to remind her of what she has bought. It is intelligible enough that the French should at the present day be willing to sacrifice something for an Imperial policy moulded by a strong Imperial arm. It is the natural reaction after the *bourgeois régime* that was blown away in the Revolution of 1848. The nation at large does not view the argument of the Imperial panegyrist as it would be regarded by the sober shrewdness of an English House of Commons. It is true, they say to themselves, that M. Persigny is a little hard upon the journalists, but what is that in comparison with a *régime* which has torn the treaties of

1815, restored to France her prestige and influence in Europe, and added, in a time of profound peace, two provinces to the national territory? The Empire is to be judged as an Empire, not to be criticized as if it belonged to the category of constitutional monarchies.

There is, however, one portion of the Opposition attack which will lay more hold on the French nation than any oratorical invectives against the coercion of the press or the intimidation of the electors. The empire is not a republic, and cannot be expected to have a republic's virtues. But Frenchmen will not fail to ask themselves from time to time, does it possess the grandeur, the nobility, and the influence that imperial France has a right to claim? "I have not," France may say to herself, "the wisdom, the calmness, the cold and clear accents of Pallas. Have I the royal step, the eye, the majesty of Juno?" Two important parts of the Imperial programme have failed, and the failure reflects discredit on the Empire, judged by its own principles. The double fiasco was cleverly pointed out by M. Favre. The French people will read what relates to it with more interest than they vouchsafe to theoretical vindications of the right of the press to abuse the Government. In both cases, the appeal is made to the honour and sensibility of the nation. First and foremost, there is Mexico. M. Favre conclusively proved that the flag of France had been despatched to the New World to protect and defend a villainous commercial intrigue. M. Billault retorts, as usual, with Imperial commonplaces, but on this point his commonplaces condemn himself. If the Empire is to be upheld because it looks to the honour of the French eagles, what shall we say when it sends the eagles abroad to fight for the interests of a clique of private and unprincipled speculators? The Mexican war is only tolerable in the eyes of the French because they are not aware of the truth about Jecker and his financial adventures. The revelation begins to dawn upon them, just as news arrives of French disaster in Mexico itself. Thus, the French Empire is placed in the position of having espoused the quarrel of a rascal, and having experienced a grave military mishap in his defence. France will not like this—indeed, it would be unnatural if she did. The French public will say to M. Billault, that they have chosen the Empire, and are ready to pay for the Empire, but that the Empire must not carelessly prostitute the dignity of France.

The attitude of the Imperial Cabinet on the subject of Italy and Poland is another thing, which will touch the French a good deal. It is quite true—as the Ministerial speakers said in the Corps Legislatif—that it is not dignified for France to interfere between Russia and Poland, unless interference is to be backed, if necessary, by something more than moral force. Nor are the body of the French anxious to go to war for the sake of Poland. But the French Empire has set before itself a *rôle*, and every time it falls short of its *rôle*, it damages the cause of Imperialism. What has become of the Imperial promise that the flag of France would be found everywhere where the cause of civilization was to be found? The cause of civilization is certainly to be found just now with suffering Poland. The Empire, however, does not propose to do anything for Poland, though it wastes men and money in Mexico. If non-intervention was its rule, nothing could be said. England, whether rightly or wrongly, gives out that she never means to go to war for an idea. Nobody, therefore, can blame her for not going to war for Poland. But the Empire professes to deserve the admiration of the world because its policy is different. Why, then, does it sit still when Polish freedom is at stake? Intervention is the order of the day in Syria, in Mexico, in Italy, and even in Cochin-China. The only person with whom Louis Napoleon declines to meddle is the Czar. The rumoured losses in Mexico occur, therefore, this week most inopportunistly. Thousands of the French will think that if blood was to be shed, it had better have been shed in the service of the Poles than in the service of Jecker. The truth seems to be that the French Emperor's good fortune has deserted him of late. It is not difficult to see the reason. He has become capricious and reactionary, and instead of doing battle for ideas, has begun to go to war for crotchets. Sooner or later the change will tell upon his popularity; and if M. Favre and his friends were wise, they would confine themselves to pointing out not so much that the French Empire is an empire as that it is an incompetent and inglorious empire.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

MR. WHALLEY has for a moment abandoned the task to which he has hitherto devoted the whole of his parliamentary energies, to undertake another which is almost as onerous. He has descended from the lofty position from which he is accustomed to keep watch against the enemies of the Protestant faith, to enter for a little into the arena of secular politics. The member for Peterborough is the guardian of the interests of Protestantism all over the world, but he is at the same time the chairman of a local railway company. In the latter capacity he has become aware of the very great inconvenience attending the present system of Private Bill Legislation. His experience is that nothing could be more adapted to prevent the investment of money in the improvement of districts at present unprovided with railways. The expense of the proceedings before parliamentary committees is so great, and the result so uncertain, that works of great local importance are not seldom left undone, from the difficulties of obtaining the proper powers from Parliament. Mr. Whalley has just obtained leave to bring in a bill for diminishing the expenses of private bills relating to railways. It is to be regretted that this important subject was not brought before the House by some member who had given more special attention to the question. Mr. Whalley's previous labours have lain in another direction. An honourable member who keeps one eye constantly on the Pope and the other on Cardinal Wiseman cannot be well qualified for dealing with the intricacies of this complicated subject. There are several members, among whom Colonel Wilson Patten holds a high place, who have devoted much labour and thought to the improvement of this branch of legislation, and who might have brought forward a measure on this subject with much greater chance of success. Mr. Whalley is well aware of the evils and disadvantages of the present system, but he is not sufficiently impressed with the difficulties of applying a remedy to them. His present attempt, if we may judge from the account of it given by himself—for the bill is not yet before us—has not the slightest chance of passing the House of Commons.

A Private Act of Parliament requires the same ceremonies as a public general statute. The bill must pass both houses, and be read three times in each. The promoters of private bills are, moreover, required by the Standing Orders to comply with a great deal of preliminary procedure as to notices, deposit of plans, and such matters. But in addition to this, after the bill has been read a second time in the House in which the proceedings commenced, it is referred to a Select Committee, in which its real merits are investigated, and by the report of which the fate of the bill is decided. This is the portion of the proceedings which is peculiar to private bills, and it is here that the enormous expense attending private legislation is principally incurred. It is to be observed that, if the bill passes this committee, it has afterwards to go through the same ordeal before a similar committee of the other House. Thus there is, in most cases, the expense of a double inquiry. The same witnesses must be examined, the same facts proved a second time, just as if no previous inquiry had taken place. The enormous expense which is thus incurred by bringing numerous witnesses up to town and keeping them there during a protracted inquiry, is further aggravated by the extreme uncertainty of the results. There is no uniformity in the decision of parliamentary committees, and the most experienced persons are therefore unable to advise with any confidence, as to the result of an application to these tribunals. This uncertainty is the necessary result of the constitution of the committees. They are composed of judges who are constantly changing, and who are therefore unable to fix on any certain rules, and thus establish uniformity of practice. Different committees may come to different decisions on the same facts. There are instances where a railway has been carried in one session on exactly the same grounds on which it was rejected in the previous one, simply because it was submitted to a different tribunal. This uncertainty is in itself an evil of very great magnitude. It is the cause of much litigation. If decisions were uniform, persons would not venture to oppose a bill before a committee on grounds which had been held insufficient on several previous occasions. Agents and counsel could advise with some certainty as to the result of a contemplated opposition, and expense would therefore be checked at the beginning. At present it is a lottery, and the principles on which committees decide are as little fixed now as they were ten years ago.

All schemes for improving the present system of private legislation have reference to the defective constitution of the tribunals to which private bills are referred. It is certain that uniformity of decision is impossible as long as the judges are constantly changing from year to year. Mr. Whalley's plan is a trenchant one, and goes to the root of the matter. A parliamentary committee is admittedly a bad tribunal—so bad that it is useless trying to mend it. Therefore do away with it altogether, and substitute another in its place. Let the merits of any proposed Bill be referred to a Board or Commission appointed for the purpose, who shall report thereon to the House. Mr. Whalley proposes that the Board of Trade should undertake that duty with respect to Railway Bills. In this proposal he follows the precedent adopted with reference to Inclosure Acts. When an application is made for the inclosure of a certain district, an assistant Commissioner is sent to hold a meeting, and hear evidence on the spot. Thereupon the Inclosure Commissioners make a report, on which Parliament acts. Against this report there is seldom any appeal. Mr. Whalley makes the mistake of supposing that the course of Railway Bills would generally be as smooth and easy as that of Inclosure Bills. If it is intended that the report of the Board of Trade should be final, and should decide the fate of the measure as completely as the report of a parliamentary committee does at present, then Parliament would, in fact, be surrendering an important part of their functions with respect to private legislation. If, on the other hand, that report is not to be final, this measure will only add one new source of expense to those already in existence. In every case of an opposed railway bill, there will be an appeal from the decision of the Board of Trade. Two great railway companies competing for traffic will not be satisfied with anything short of a decision by a parliamentary tribunal. Experience has shown that all preliminary inquiries and reports made previously to the investigation before the committee have ended by simply adding to the expense without increasing the certainty of the result.

For these reasons the present attempt to improve the system of private legislation cannot be regarded as a very hopeful one. Mr. Whalley seems to suppose that there was a very unanimous concurrence of opinion, among the witnesses who gave evidence on this subject before the Lords' Committee in 1858, in favour of some such scheme as that he has embodied in his bills. But this is very far from being the case, and that committee did not go farther than suggest some minor improvements in the way of conducting the business. Much of the evidence is, in fact, conclusive against his plan. That of Colonel Wilson Patten shows that he anticipates improvement rather from a simplification of the business than from the substitution of another tribunal. The committees that sit on several classes of bills have succeeded in introducing uniformity into their decisions, and establishing fixed rules for conducting their business. This is accomplished by always selecting the chairman of these committees from two or three members who have devoted special attention to the subject, and who always consent to sit. The decisions of the Roads Committee have in this way attained as much certainty as those of a court of law, where the judges are strictly bound by preceding cases. The labour of sitting upon railway committees is so great, that members who have once acted as chairmen are not willing to consent to do so a second time. If, however, the issues that are brought before these tribunals could be narrowed, and the labour thus diminished, as in a variety of ways it seems possible to do, it would be possible very much to improve railway committees, without affecting to so great an extent the power of Parliament over private bills.

THE THRONE OF GREECE.

THE papers which have just been laid before Parliament on the revolution in Greece are chiefly interesting because they contain in full the correspondence which has passed between Lord Russell and Prince Gortschakoff on the succession to the vacant throne. We are thus furnished with the key to that mysterious delay which seemed intended to encourage the Greeks to persevere in the election of Prince Alfred as their future king, and which at one time almost induced the belief in this country that her Majesty's Government had departed from the policy which it was understood they had decided to adopt, and were disposed seriously to consider the expediency of yield-

ing to those national aspirations which were being so fervently expressed in Greece. In the papers before us, however, we are enlightened as to the motives which influenced a policy apparently of so vacillating a character; and if Lord Russell has laid himself open, in his late correspondence with the Pope, to the charge of ingenuous simplicity, which may have somewhat shaken our faith in his diplomatic proficiency, he has redeemed himself in our eyes by the skill with which he has foiled the manœuvres of Prince Gortschakoff. Considering the intriguing character of Russian policy in the East, and more especially the means which the agents of the Emperor have for many years past unblushingly employed to gain an influence in Greece, there is something suspicious in the anxious disclaimer of Prince Gortschakoff to Lord Napier in one of the first conversations on the subject which takes place between them. Lord Napier had reported that the Vice-Chancellor, Prince Gortschakoff, "had disclaimed" any designs whatever on behalf of the Duke of Leuchtenberg, or "any secret policy." The Vice-Chancellor seemed to object, but slightly, to the expression "designs whatever;" he, however, added that Lord Napier's statement was scarcely sufficiently strong; he had in a former conversation reiterated twice that Russia had no mental reservation, no cupidity ("arrière-pensée"—"convoitise") in regard to the Greek succession. He begged Lord Napier to state these words exactly and emphatically. Had Prince Gortschakoff honestly said, "We do not pretend that we are not especially interested in this succession; our policy in Greece is too well known for me to deny that we have a definite object in view, and I will not conceal from you that we shall endeavour to carry it out by all the fair means in our power," this Government would have been considerably embarrassed. We must either have accepted Prince Alfred's nomination and run the risk of a war with Russia, or we must have allowed Russia to push as a candidate the Duke of Leuchtenberg. Fortunately the Prince, judging of others by his own standard of morality, was only the more convinced, by our protestations to the contrary, that we were as anxious to place Prince Alfred on the throne of Greece as he was to secure it for the Duke of Leuchtenberg; and, by allowing this idea to obtain full possession of his mind, and encouraging it during the period of the election by that reticence which was so much blained at the time, our Government induced Prince Gortschakoff to assent in a panic to a joint note, excluding his candidate, as well as our own. These transactions all appear very fully in the papers before us, and we cannot but derive a secret gratification when we follow the phases through which the Russian Minister passed. First, in October, he attempts to clear the ground for the Duke as follows:—"His Excellency then stated that on one point the Emperor will not fail to insist, namely, that the future Sovereign of Greece, whoever he may be, shall belong to the national religion, in conformity with the stipulations in force on that subject." At this time he is prepared to maintain that the Duke of Leuchtenberg is not a member of the Imperial family; so he does not hesitate to say, "That the Emperor will adhere to that engagement by which the protecting Powers have declared the members of their respective reigning families incapable of occupying the throne of Greece." Upon this, Lord Russell replies, that her Majesty's Government are prepared "to instruct her Majesty's Minister at Athens to declare that Great Britain will not consent, any more than the other two protecting Powers, to the throne of Greece being accepted by such a Prince, such a declaration applying to his Imperial Highness the Duke of Leuchtenberg." The Vice-Chancellor hereupon observes to Lord Napier, "that the Russian Government could not accede to the proposal to make the desired declaration by anticipation at Athens." The Vice-Chancellor at the same time demurred to giving him a definite answer to his question respecting the quality and exclusion of the Duke of Leuchtenberg. The question whether the Duke was a Prince of the Imperial family, in the sense contemplated by the treaty, and thus excluded from the throne of Greece, "was susceptible of juridical discussion." This, it will be remembered, was the Duke in whose favour there was no "arrière pensée" or "convoitise." It was not to be wondered at if, after this, Lord Russell resorted to a very justifiable ruse to thwart the intrigue of the Russian Minister. He allowed it to be supposed that the British Government might accept the nomination of Prince Alfred to the vacant throne.

The declaration of the Emperor of France on the matter did not tend to reassure the Cabinet at St. Petersburg. "The Emperor's Government," says M. Drouyn de Lhuys, "would not think themselves authorized to refuse indefinitely their recognition of a Prince whom the Hellenic nation, without taking account of these declarations, should elect by free suffrage." So far, then, as France was concerned, Prince Alfred had nothing to fear. Meantime, the national enthusiasm was attaining a pitch little short of frenzy in Greece; it was evident that under no circumstances could a Russian Duke hope for election, and the Prince, in a fit of spleen and mortification, refers the progress of events in Greece to English instigation. "His Excellency alluded again to the contrivances and incitements by which the alleged candidature of his Royal Highness Prince Alfred had been promoted in Greece—to electioneering arts, to the exhibition of specious inducements, the encouragement of hopes, and the distribution of gold." How thoroughly mistaken his Excellency was, in his ideas of the sentiments by which the British public were actuated, may be imagined, when he could suppose we would spend gold to secure Prince Alfred's election. It was upon this hypothesis he acted; convinced that the darling object of English ambition was to see one of our own princes on the Greek throne; convinced also that the election of a Russian was out of the question, Prince Gortschakoff sets his wits to work in order to thwart so dire a catastrophe. It is of no avail to hold out any longer upon the "juridical" question of the Duke of Leuchtenberg's relationship; there is nothing to be gained by insisting upon a candidate of the Greek Church; the time has gone by for such petty obstacles to stay the overwhelming force of universal suffrage. Now, he regrets not having acceded to the declaration at first proposed by Lord Russell; he has himself rejected the only means by which he could now hope to carry his point. Unable at the outset to conceive it possible that we were disinterested, in a proposal by which we voluntarily excluded the popular candidate, he suspects even yet that one of those "arrières-pensées," which he disclaimed so vehemently himself, may influence England. Something must be done. He decides on abandoning the Duke of Leuchtenberg. This is how he does it: "If, however," said the Vice-Chancellor, "we turned from the mere contemplation of the treaty to regard the question as one of general policy, the exclusion of the Duke of Leuchtenberg might be recommended on many considerations. He had from the first moment never contemplated the election of the Duke as desirable. He had always been personally opposed to it, and in all his communications with the Emperor this sentiment had been constantly expressed. He held that the election of the Duke of Leuchtenberg would not be in the interests of Russia."

We are at a loss to conceive why he did not say so at first. He would have saved the Greeks a grievous disappointment, and himself the charge, which these papers so clearly confirm, of a crooked and tortuous policy. Of course, there is no objection now to his making the joint declaration, the notion of which was so repulsive to him at first; and so at last we have the following laconic and significant despatch from Lord Napier: "My Lord,—When I was with Prince Gortschakoff this afternoon, his Excellency telegraphed to Count Blondoff, in reply to an application from that Minister, that he might combine with his English and French colleagues in a joint communication to the Greek Government, in the sense of the declarations exchanged in London, in relation to the exclusion of Princes of the three reigning Houses from the throne of Greece." And so ends this very instructive diplomatic episode, in which it is some consolation to see that a straightforward, honest policy fully justified the old proverb by its success.

MORAL POWER IN POLITICS.

"WHAT is this moral power, the exercise of which is now the policy of England?" asked Mr. Disraeli in the course of last session, and the answer he gave himself was as follows:—"I will tell you what moral power means. It means warlike armaments in time of peace. It means garrisons doubled and trebled. It means squadrons turned into fleets. And in an age of mechanical inventions to which there is no assignable limit, it means a perpetual stimulus given to the study of the science of destruction. That is moral power." But this definition was not of a kind to satisfy the milder wisdom of Lord Palmerston, and he, too, tried his hand at some-

thing better. "Why, sir, what is moral power?" he asked in his turn. "It is simply the power of persuasion. It is simply the power which opinion exercises." When we have thus had from the rival leaders of the House diametrically opposite definitions of a power, the use of which, it is agreed on all sides, should constitute the essence of English policy abroad, it becomes a problem of interest to discover where the truth really lies, and to whom belongs the better understanding. When Lord Palmerston gets up in the House next after night and declares that England has bound herself to non-intervention, and will exercise no power abroad but moral power, and then explains moral power to be "simply persuasion," it is, of course, open to any member who is foolish enough to take him *au pied de la lettre*, to denounce the folly and the wickedness of maintaining enormous armaments in time of peace, unless the Government anticipate an unprovoked attack upon ourselves—a contingency which they strenuously refuse to contemplate, everlastingly declaring that they are on the best possible terms with all their neighbours. Simple persuasion wants nothing more than good counsels and the ability to give them adequate expression. It belongs as much to the weak in material power as to the strong; but by the sad teaching of experience, we know that the hand of a potentate stretched out to plunder and to wrong, with a prospect of impunity, has never yet been stayed by mere logic and rhetoric. No man living, perhaps, has less faith in the efficacy of pure and unadulterated persuasion than Lord Palmerston himself. He probably believes in it about as much as he believes in original sin. In loud and often blustering tones, he has declared that the only secure foundation for the Anglo-French alliance and the "entente cordiale" is a wholesome respect for each other's material strength. But if England and France are to influence each other by simple persuasion, what have they to consider but the excellence of the advice that may be mutually tendered from time to time? and with that the relative measures of their material strength have no legitimate connection.

It is a mere truism to say that much of the moral power, which has made a fair show in state-papers and in the speeches of kings and ministers, was precisely the kind of moral power which a highwayman exercised when he demanded a traveller's purse with a pistol at his head. Moral power in another form, equally simple but less coarse than the highwayman's, is exercised every day at a public school. Sometimes a small boy has the luck to secure the especial protection of a big one, and as soon as that is known, the small boy is sure of an unmolested life. The protector is very possibly quite incapable of persuading anybody to do any single thing by purely intellectual resources; but there, however, is moral power enshrined in two yards of stature, a muscular arm, and a vigorous leg; and the value of this support the little boy learns when his protector departs. Very similar to this, if we may ascend at once from small things to great, was the moral power, in the shadow of which the peasants of a Piedmontese valley were able to worship God in peace after their own fashion, while Cromwell lived; for these poor folk, as the Pope, the Duke of Savoy, and all Catholic Christendom well understood, had a promise of succour from a man who kept his word, and was himself the consummate general of perhaps the finest soldiers the world ever saw. Take again that holy, meek, and modest thing which plays so large a part in the affairs of mankind at the present time—the moral power of France, or rather of Louis Napoleon. The essence of his moral power is simply this—that he is the head of a people the most prone to aggressive warfare, and can by a word set in motion the greatest of European armies. When a not very scrupulous man has his finger on the trigger of a very formidable weapon, his neighbours will, of course, tolerate a certain amount of annoyance to avert the discharge of the piece at them. Among peace-and-quiet-loving people it answers for the most part to be overbearing up to a certain point. The worst-tempered member of a family is usually allowed to have his own way; and it is the same in the family of nations. When peace is a matter of paramount importance to the mass of mankind, any nation readier than the rest to come to blows, and able to hit very hard, must always exercise immense moral power of a particular kind. So long, then, as Louis Napoleon plays skilfully on a few chords of the French character—their vanity, their dread of anarchy and socialism, and the materialism of their desires—and thereby remains absolute master of the French army, his single voice will be the weightiest in the councils of Europe; and this it will be without the display of any great ability on his part in international politics. His vacillating policy would ruin a weak State in six months. What he did during the siege of Gaeta is a fair sample of his tactics. For a time he muffled the Sardinian attack by laying his fleet between them and the land; but he eventually removed his fleet, having

kept it there long enough to give the bitterest offence to the Italians, but not long enough to save Gaeta and win the gratitude of the king of Naples. Cavour, the responsible minister of a small State, beat him, the unquestioned lord of a hundred legions, by sheer force of intellect. To retain, however, the kind of moral power which Louis Napoleon now exercises, care must be taken not to carry insolence and encroachment a little too far. There is a limit to the patience of the most peaceable people; and when that limit is reached, they will begin to use their arms and legs. Louis Napoleon has hitherto shown himself superior to his greater uncle in this,—that he has known where to stop. The first Napoleon made himself such a dire curse to all Europe, that it could endure him no longer.

As the world goes now, the foundation of moral power, in international politics, is the possibility of an ultimate resort to physical power; and, hope as we may that a better time will come when this shall be no longer, its advent is still far beyond human ken. Where critical negotiations are being carried on between Powers of equal or nearly equal strength, whose interests have clashed, the most fatal of diplomatic mistakes is the premature betrayal of an intention, on one side, not to fight in any case for the subject-matter of the dispute. When that secret is out, the other side is pretty sure to win. The practised diplomat of a Power that does not mean to fight will, to the last moment, neither threaten nor bluster, but talk solemnly of "grave consequences" and the cessation of cordial relations. For a mistake of this kind made by ourselves we need only go back to the time of the annexation of Savoy and Nice. If moral power, as represented by simple persuasion, had any effect on our ally across the water, these annexations would assuredly not have been carried out. There was no lack of persuasiveness either in the English Parliament or press. Both the one and the other were lavish of arguments, warnings, remonstrances, and appeals to the Emperor's feelings, without the smallest effect. Indeed, they did more harm than good, and defeated their own object; for, through these discussions in Parliament and the papers, the Emperor saw clearly that the English people had no intention whatever of fighting for Savoy and Nice. Thus we suffered him to sound the depths of our forbearance without finding bottom; and from that hour he could snap his fingers at Lord Russell's despatches, and the fate of the two provinces was sealed. There is, again, the other dangerous mistake of allowing your opponent to think that you will not on any account go to war, when in reality you are prepared to do so if it be necessary. Of this kind of mistake the origin of the Crimean war has left us a melancholy instance; and Mr. Kinglake has only adopted what has been for some time a popular idea,—that the Crimean war was, in a great measure, brought on by Lord Aberdeen's known horror of war, and the Emperor Nicholas's conviction that the Peace party were true representatives of the national feeling in England.

Even, however, in these days, there is a kind of moral power purer than that of which we have hitherto been speaking; purer, in that recourse to physical power is here more kept out of sight. It is admitted, for example, that the strength and greatness of England is a moral support to the Liberal party in every state on the Continent. That party stands to the England of to-day in a relation something like that in which the Protestant sects on the Continent stood to the England of Elizabeth and Cromwell. The prospect of armed assistance from England was, no doubt, much nearer to the Continental Protestants of old than it can be to the Liberal party now. To Elizabeth and Cromwell non-intervention would have seemed a strange doctrine; but the Continental Liberals well know that, lavish as we are with our sympathy, we never dream of firing a shot out of pure love for them. Some day, they hope, when the defence of our own private interests has dragged us into a war, and our hands have warmed to the work, as they always do, then, perhaps, we may do a little business for them; and this is their utmost hope. They have, nevertheless, a direct interest in the prosperity and greatness of England, which they can point to as the practical results of the principles that they strive to establish in their own countries. Tranquillity and wealth within, respect and influence abroad, are what all men desire for the states to which they belong; and the condition of England goes to prove that these good things may very well exist together with Liberal and constitutional principles. The years immediately following the Crimean war were a gloomy period to the Liberal party on the Continent; for the military prestige of England was then at a low ebb, and constitutional government was thought to have broken down under the rude trial of a great war. This kind of moral power has also been exerted, with brilliant success, by the constitutional government of Piedmont; by moral power alone it

sapped the foundations of other Italian governments which rested on despotic principles and the support of Austria, and thus it became itself a centre of attraction to all Italy. Even behind this moral power there lurks the shadow of physical power; but here recourse to physical power will not be had by the state which exerts the moral power. Such a state acts only upon the minds and opinions of men in other states; it forms parties abroad, who advocate its own principles. And, if all goes well, these parties will in time become strong enough to establish such principles by their own physical force, if necessary; in other words, they become strong enough to undertake successful revolutions. And, with respect to moral power of this nature, we may quote the testimony of a man who thoroughly understood the forces that govern the political world. "In the economy of wealth, in politics, and in religion," said Count Cavour, "ideas alone can contend with effect against ideas,—principles alone get the better of principles; material compression goes for little in such a struggle. For a while cannon and bayonets may silence doctrines and maintain the existing order of things; but if these doctrines come to prevail in men's minds, sooner or later they will pass into practical results, and change the face of the world."

Public opinion, we often say, rules the world, and so, no doubt, it does; and public opinion is a vast aggregate of moral power. When public opinion is brought to bear adversely on any state, its strength lies in the apprehensions which it excites of a recourse to arms. Among nations, one towards the other, mere moral disapprobation goes for very little. Witness the Emperor Nicholas's attack on Turkey, and the annexation of Savoy and Nice. The more searching, however, the glare of publicity, and the greater the body of opinion thrown on every political act, the better it will be for the world. Fewer will be the wrongs perpetrated. As Mr. Kinglake has observed in his recently published volumes, the interests, the passions, and the foibles which lead to war, are more likely to be found in one man armed with absolute power than in a Cabinet of Ministers. The anger, the petulance, or the wounded vanity of one minister may be held in check by the other ministers who do not share the feeling; and in the same way the wrongdoing tendencies of one nation should be restrained by the opposition of other nations. Public opinion is the chief instrument of restraint. A large ingredient, of course, in the formation of public opinion on most questions, is merely a calculation of selfish interests; but there is nothing to lament in this, for the world requires an equilibrium of interests and forces. The main strength, however, of public opinion, lies in the fact that when men are not swayed by interest or passion, they deliberately prefer good to evil. To regret that men condemn in others the very things they do themselves when they fall under a like temptation, is a great mistake. It is well for the world that one imperfect being condemns another, for if it were not so, public opinion would have for its standard what men think and do in their worst moments, instead of in their best moments, as it should be. The pressure, therefore, of a vast body of disinterested and adversely interested opinion upon any nation disposed to do wrong, is the best security for peace; for it is generally impossible to foresee when opinion will have recourse to arms. That the time may come when moral disapprobation alone will be sufficient to restrain, is what we must all devoutly desire; but assuredly the time is yet far off. If we would hasten its coming, we must labour to strengthen the bonds of international intimacy. Isolation begets indifference to the opinion of others. The more dependent men become on one another, the more they covet the approbation, and shrink from the censure of those among whom they live. Meanwhile, for many a long day to come, it will be difficult to find any moral power, exercised in international politics, which is not more or less remotely connected with physical power.

BREACH OF PROMISE OF MARRIAGE.

SINCE the great leading case of *Bardell v. Pickwick*, a more comical action than that of *Russell v. Adams*, which occupied the Court of Exchequer during the first half of the present week, has seldom, if ever, been tried,—comical as regarded its general effect; to the unlucky defendant it was no laughing matter at the time, though we hope it will be now for the rest of his life. The scene was laid, as most of our readers are aware, in a station of life rather more genteel than that in which poor Mrs. Bardell moved, with her friends—Mrs. Mudberry "which kept a mangle," and Mrs. Bunkin "which clear-starched." Our leading novelists are in the nature of social detectives, whose business it is to know the amusing classes of society; and Mrs. Russell and her daughter

would appear to belong rather to the beat of Mr. Thackeray than to that of Mr. Dickens. She seems to have talked in the witness-box just like the shabby-genteel characters in "Vanity Fair" or "Pendennis;" indeed, she may, perhaps, have studied the part of Mrs. McKenzie in the "Newcomes." She was, it appears, an Irishwoman, in what are called reduced circumstances, though of a high family and magnanimous disposition. It appeared from her examination in chief, that one of her uncles was an admiral, another a dean, her brother a rector, and three of her nephews also rectors. It appeared from her cross-examination that "she might have said" to tradesmen she was a connection of Earl Russell's, which was very probably true if she went far enough back. She had "made use of an accomplishment acquired in earlier and happier days," by teaching music—at first "under the patronage of the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel," and afterwards in other distinguished families. Where she lived at the time of the action, she declined to say, objecting to have her private affairs dragged before the public, and referring the inquisitive Mr. Lush to her solicitor. This heroic matron was acting as housekeeper to a Mr. Crump in November, 1860. According to her statement, she was to have 40 guineas a year. According to Mr. Crump, she was taken in out of charity, was to have nothing at all except board and lodging, and could not be got out of the house, when she was once in it, for nearly five months. During the residence with Mr. Crump she had occasion to take one of the children to Mr. Adams, an eminent medical man, on account of a deformed foot; and when she could not go herself, she sent her daughter on the same errand. Mr. Adams carried on his business in London, but he had also a house at Hampstead, where he lived openly with his wife and family, coming to town to attend his patients. According to Mrs. Russell's statement, she heard from her daughter in November, 1860, that Mr. Adams had made her an offer of marriage, and wrote him a letter, describing her circumstances and connections. The copy of this letter she said she had lost, and on the part of Mr. Adams, it was denied that it had ever been written. Mrs. Russell also said that she called on Mr. Adams in the winter of 1860, and took lodgings, at his request, at the house of a Mrs. Lama, in Osnaburgh-street, in March, 1861. She did undoubtedly take the lodgings, and gave a reference to Mr. Adams as her medical attendant. They lived at Osnaburgh-street till July 6th, and Mr. Adams frequently called there. According to Mrs. Russell, his visits were those of a lover. He used to put his arm round Miss Russell's waist, and make references to their future marriage. According to Mr. Adams, the visits were those of a medical man to a patient. Mrs. Russell's evidence was altogether uncorroborated. Indeed she was the only witness called for the plaintiff. Mr. Adams, on the contrary, called Mrs. Lama, the lodginghouse-keeper, who said that his visits lasted only for ten or fifteen minutes, except on one occasion, when he stayed from 9-30 till 12, and sang. He put in letters from Miss Russell, which related chiefly to her mother's health, thanked him for a loan of £5, were signed "Yours faithfully," and contained no expressions of endearment. He also called his coachman, who said that when he drove his master there, Mrs. Adams was generally in the carriage, and a boy often on the box; that his master used to take his visit to the Russells in its turn with other visits, and that on one occasion he asked him (the coachman) whether there were any more visits on the list? The coachman answered, "Only them people in Osnaburgh-street;" to which Mr. Adams replied, "They be damned!"—an excusable observation from a busy doctor with regard to a tiresome patient, but a wonderful speech from a gentleman to his servant about a young woman with whom he was in love. Mrs. Lama also said that, after the Russells had been a few days in the house, Mrs. Russell told her that Mr. Adams was going to marry her daughter, and ran in debt with her to the extent of £34, a large part of which was for a quantity of gin and brandy drunk by the two ladies. Mrs. Lama spoke to Miss Russell several times about her marriage, and asked her, amongst other things, who the lady was that came in the carriage, and where was the mother of the boy on the box. Miss Russell replied, that the mother of the boy "was in her grave," and that the lady was Mr. Adams's sister. After the Russells left, Mr. Adams called, and Mrs. Lama told him that they said he was engaged to Miss Russell; upon which he immediately said, "What, me paying my addresses to Miss Russell? why, I am a married man with a family." Mrs. Lama also told Mr. Adams she kept them in the house on the faith of the engagement.

After the Russells left Osnaburgh-street, Mr. Adams and a Mr. Blaise, the instrument-maker who made the shoe for the deformed

child, called together on Miss Russell at other lodgings, and had some conversation with her. Mrs. Russell says:—

Mr. Blaise said, "Will you excuse me, but did you ever hear that Mr. Adams is married?" I was staggered. I said, "Mr. Adams a married man! how could I have heard that, when he has been engaged to my daughter nearly twelve months; and not only engaged, but he wanted to have a private marriage unknown to me?" Mr. Adams said, "Who told you that?" I said, "My daughter." He said, "Pray, can you tell me when I made that proposition for a private marriage?" I said, "Yes, on the 23rd of December." He said to her, "Oh, I did not think you would tell every word to your mamma." I put my hand on the Bible and said, "Here my hand is on the sacred volume, and the other in yours; you know we never heard that you were a married man. If you have behaved dishonourably it will be bad, indeed, to her widowed mother." I put my arm round his waist, and said, "How often have I seen you do this and say, 'My dear, dear girl, thank God you will be mine.'" I then turned to Mr. Blaise, and said, "How could I believe Mr. Adams was a married man when I have seen him do that to my own child?" He said, "Oh, if my wife heard one-fourth of this about me she would not stay under my roof."

Why Mr. Adams should have taken Mr. Blaise to hear all this eloquence it is impossible to suggest. Mr. Blaise's account of the matter was very different. He said that they found Miss Russell alone at first, and Mr. Adams said to her, "Did I ever propose marriage to you, or take any liberties with you?" She said "No."

Mrs. Russell then rushed in, very much enraged, and said, two to one was not fair, and she would not have her daughter abused. She then asked what it all meant by his being there, and said that Mrs. Lama had told an untruth, and that her solicitor would write to Mrs. Lama on the subject. Mrs. Russell then said to her daughter, "Is it true that you have written to Mr. Adams without consulting me?" and her daughter said, "Yes;" upon which Mrs. Russell exclaimed, "Then you have made us lose all."

There was some more evidence in contradiction of Mrs. Russell, upon whose unsupported testimony the whole case of the plaintiff rested. The jury at one point in the case interfered, and most of them seemed to think that the case ought to stop; but one jurymen, with considerable warmth, said it must go on, and after a long consultation they coupled their verdict for the defendant with the observation that they found for him, because "the plaintiff has not made out her case to our entire satisfaction." They would have been the strangest jury that ever sat in a box if she had. It should, however, be observed, that one of them put a question to the judge "in a strong Irish accent." Blood is thicker than water, and Mrs. Russell's eloquence may have touched a chord in a countryman's heart, though to an English ear such expressions as "My hand is on the sacred volume and the other in yours," and "There are three things which money cannot purchase—virtue, family, and a British jury," is the peculiar dialect of perjury. Whatever the jury may have thought, the public at large will think Mr. Adams the most unlucky man that ever suffered for his good nature.

Two or three points connected with the case have more general interest than its ludicrous and painful features. To a lay eye, the rejection of some of the evidence tendered on behalf of the defendant may seem surprising. He offered to prove that the plaintiffs had obtained credit at two other places, by pretending falsely that the daughter was going to be married. This evidence was rejected as tending to raise a collateral issue. In the particular case it was probably a hardship. Certainly, if such evidence had been given and believed, no one in his senses would have hesitated a moment about the verdict. Why, then, was it excluded? The answer is, that rules of evidence are merely practical expedients devised for the purpose of bringing trials into a manageable and compendious shape. If every question which has any relation to the main point at issue were examined to the bottom, there would be no end to such inquiries. Suppose, for instance, evidence had been given that Mrs. Russell had falsely told—say Mrs. Smith—that her daughter was to be married to Mr. Jones, and had so obtained credit, and suppose Mrs. Smith had been called as a witness for that purpose. By the same principle, Mrs. Smith might have been asked whether she had not committed perjury, and, on her denial, Mrs. Thompson might be called to prove that she had. Mrs. Thompson might be charged with being a woman of dissolute habits, and this might depend on the evidence of Mrs. Watson, who might be taxed with being an habitual drunkard on the credit of Mrs. Brown; and thus the contagion might spread through the whole London Directory. The experience of courts-martial shows that this is by no means an imaginary risk. When Captain Robertson was tried a year ago at Dublin, the contradictions on collateral points ran to such a length that the case seemed endless and was utterly unintelligible; and the same is often the case in French trials. The rule in our courts is that a witness may be asked questions as to his credit, but unless

they are relevant to the issue, his answer cannot be contradicted, though, if false, he may be punished by an indictment for perjury. If Mrs. Russell really did say what it is suggested she said, she is liable to an indictment. On the whole, it would be difficult to make a better rule for practical purposes.

We can suggest another complaint against our existing system which is far more reasonable. Why could not Mr. Adams and Miss Russell be called to tell their own stories in their own way? This is now permitted in nearly every action, and it is impossible to suggest any reason why this particular action should form an exception. Modesty can have nothing to do with it. In actions for seduction, the woman seduced always has to give evidence; and if a woman has acted with propriety, and has really been ill-treated, why should she be ashamed to tell her story if she is not ashamed to bring the action? People who will take money for their feelings are not usually so thin-skinned. The truth is, that these actions, as well as the cognate action for seduction, are great blemishes to the law. They proceed upon a misconception of the whole theory of actions. The object of an action is to compensate a sufferer, not to fine a wrong-doer; and in both of these classes of actions the two functions are mixed up in a most undignified and even ludicrous way. There is something very offensive in the notion of paying a woman for a wound to her feelings; and this is generally the chief injury which a breach of promise to marry inflicts. Cases may no doubt occur where it is otherwise. To break such a promise after a long engagement, for instance, might consign a woman to want for life; but means might be taken to provide for this, and at the same time to free the law from the scandal which such proceedings are calculated to bring upon it.

BLUE JACKETS AND STEAM JACKETS.

THE sailor, who chose all the grog in the world and all the tobacco in the world for two of the three wishes, the realization of which was offered to him by the benevolent genius, could think of nothing further that human nature could possibly desire, and for his third wish chose "more grog." If what the newspapers tell us be true, a change has come over the spirit of the British navy. A strange yearning for roast beef has suddenly penetrated and inflamed those rough hearts, whose march is o'er the ocean wave and whose home is on the deep. Jack is turning gentleman, and looking out for the comforts of life. He does not despise grog and tobacco in the abstract; he will say nothing against them; they have had their day, and very good fellows, in their way, have been content with them. But it is an age of progress, and sailors, as well as others, must advance with the times. He would himself prefer his food tender, succulent, and with the gravy in it. He will be always happy to serve his country as before, and if the deck of one of her Majesty's ships wants swabbing, he will swab it. But henceforward it must be understood that with regard to cookery he has the feelings of his kind. He does not wish to thrust himself forward out of his place; the undercook was no doubt intended by Nature, if not by the Articles of War, to belong to the boatswain and boatswain's mate, and far be it from him to interfere with their prerogatives. But when all prior claims are satisfied, let the able-bodied seaman have his due. Let it be roasted not too fast, done to a rich brown, and let it be served hot. The request is really so reasonable that our Admiralty would have indeed a heart of stone if they refused it. Hot let it be, replies Lord Clarence Paget, and brown. A distinguished naval officer has taken the trouble to invent an arrangement by which meat is roasted without a kitchen-range, and his method is to be tried, in the first place, on a single ship, by way of experiment. We are prevented, by total ignorance of the subject of culinary engineering, from explaining completely the mysterious apparatus in question, further than by saying that it employs the services of a steam-jacket, whatever that may be, to keep the meat warm. The grand result, however, is, that if it should be introduced into the navy, the bold mariners of England will, for the future, enjoy roast beef for dinner for the nine months of the year during which, upon an average, each ship of the line is in harbour. Whether the machinery produces horse-radish sauce by the same process at the same time, does not appear. We are inclined, upon *a priori* grounds, to believe that it certainly does.

The ordinary fare of the navy has hitherto not been such as to pamper the crews into effeminacy. As compared with a Lord Mayor's dinner, for example, or the daily repast of a convict at Dartmoor, it has been distinctly bad. There is much to be said in favour of boiled beef, as boiled beef appears at the tables of the richer classes; not over-salt, that is, and with the appurtenances and condiments which custom has immemorially sanctioned. But

this is not the form which it takes on board the gallant Thunder-bomb. Plunged into the ship's coppers for some hours, it manages to issue again a mass of tough fibre, a *rudis indigestibilisque moles*, so to speak, which can only be sanctioned by the authorities on the broad but delusive ground that meat is meat. The salt pork chiefly differs from the salt beef in being rather worse. It is more hard, more salt, more unwholesome, more unsuited for beings who are not debarred by a life of maritime adventure from the possession of an alimentary canal. Look at the pease, again. Art and nature might in vain compete to produce anything more tasteless than the regulation maritime split pea. Part of the system the pease may be, but they are a hard part. Ye gentlemen of England that live at home at ease, how little do ye think upon the uncalled-for, the truly abnormal insipidity, of the pease. Now, at the small charge of eight shillings per man, everything can be changed. Eight shillings per man, and every vessel in the service can have its steam-jacket to itself, and cook accordingly. The meanest sailor in the fore-castle will have the pride of knowing that if he has a bit of sirloin to roast, he can have it roasted to a turn. The time has clearly come that the kitchen department of the navy should, to use Sir John Pakington's phrase, be reconstructed. Henceforward when we style a person the "son of a sea-cook," we shall imply a pedigree full of dignity and honour. Henceforward Britannia, when she rules the waves, will leave upon every line she traces the fragrance of her national dish.

There were three sailors of Bristol city, says the brief but touching epic, and they took a ship for to go to sea. If ever the story of naval adventure which it embodies should gain the wide renown of the "Odyssey," it will be easy for the commentators of future ages to fix the date of the poem by the allusions which it contained to the commissariat of the enterprising west-countrymen. To steam-jackets there is not a single allusion, and there is nothing whatever in the whole narrative to imply the possession of a roasting apparatus:—

Then with pork and captain's biskee,
Then with pork and captain's biskee,
They victualled She, they victualled She.

Such is the simple account, the truth of which commends itself to the reader's mind by its faithful representation of manners, and its conformity to fact even in its minute details. The primitive customs of the nineteenth century—so it will be argued a thousand years hence—are represented to the life in a story which is, to its very grammar, natural and unaffected. It is true that the commentator of the future will be in error if he infers the existence of cannibalism on board modern English vessels, from the proposal which the poem contains, of sacrificing the life of the youthful William; but the mention of salt-pork and biscuit he will justly regard as belonging to the class of undesigned, and, therefore, suggestive coincidences. It is not uninteresting to speculate what, at this remote period, will form the staple of maritime dinners. Slight as are the materials for the problem, it can hardly be wrong to conjecture that, now that improvements are once started, the taste of the navy will rapidly follow the fashion of the age. As a matter of course it will be held as brutal to supply a monotonous diet of roast beef as it would now be thought liberal to grant it on festive occasions. The fare will be generous, but it will be varied. Perhaps it will be best to leave the question of dining *à la Russe*, or retaining the old insular fashion, to the judgment of the men themselves. We do not think that a Government need ever consider itself bound to provide more than one *entrée* a day, unless public opinion and the good of the service imperatively demand it. The cellar, too, on board ship must always be furnished, even by the most liberal of purveyors, with due regard to national economy. But in regard to drumsticks, for example, or cold meat, or the miserable compromise of hash, it may be safely prophesied that no future Lord of the Admiralty will ever be hurled from power by the unanimous voice of an indignant people for an attempt to return in such matters of culinary detail to parsimonious traditions worthy only of the age of pork.

But is all this to be believed? Is a sea-faring life really to become a sumptuously-faring one, and are our sailors to be treated to as generous a diet as our malefactors? Can the change be a salutary one? Can discipline be maintained upon roast beef? Can the fore-castle pay sufficient reverence to the quarter-deck when it is no worse off in respect of its daily cookery? Is Spartan courage, or is it not, the companion of Spartan diet? It is a question for the Admiralty to take into its mature consideration. Trafalgar and St. Vincent were won by men who were glad enough to get their rations boiled. If the food which was good enough for Nelson's crews is not good enough for the crews of to-day, is it degeneracy of race that is at fault, or is it only degeneracy of

digestion? Certainly, if the mariners of England who guard our native shores do become seriously addicted to the pleasures of the table, the sun of our nautical supremacy is set. It is no use expecting that a sailor who has just been enjoying a surfeit of the Sunday-side can be in a fit state to belay a marling-sheet, or taut a bowline, or handspike a main-jib-boom. Tom Bowling, if he is to perform the traditional feat of "going aloft" with any degree either of comfort to himself or credit to his employers, must have prepared himself for the task by a judiciously severe *régime*. A clear eye and steady hand is surely required for the difficult task of reefing the jury-masts, or any of the other manœuvres with which Captain Marryat's novels have rendered us all so familiar. Still, if the service will not suffer for it, we wish the sailors well fed. Within the bounds of reason let them have all the luxury that steam-jackets are able to afford. If our humble voice can have any influence over the eminent naval officer whose tones in the House of Commons always so ably unite the wisdom of the minister and the harmlessness of the sea-captain, we would urge Lord Clarence Paget to concede the eight shillings'-worth of roasting. We only hope that the British tar will not hereafter look back with longing eyes at the simple fare of his earlier career, and, amid the luxuries of a civilized *ménue*, and the choicest delicacies of the season, pine remorselessly for the grog and tobacco of his uncultivated, but not unenjoyable, repasts.

DUTCH NOTES.

WHEN we remember that the passengers on board a steam-vessel, of very moderate power, which crosses the bar of the Brill at one o'clock, may easily, in fine weather, see the light on the North Foreland by nine, it does seem strange that so very little is known in this country about Holland. It is not that people never go there, for a fair proportion of our autumn travellers begin or end their tour with a visit to Rotterdam and the Hague; but three or four days are thought enough to devote to "the simple secrets of the Dutch;" and Paul Potter's "Bull" would appear to be the object which dwells most fondly in the imagination of many, who have no particular interest either in cattle or their painters.

The small number of Dutchmen who find their way into English society is not less remarkable. Let any one who can look back on thirty years of London life try to recollect how many he has met, putting out of question members of the diplomatic body. And yet the Dutch travel a good deal, and believe, rightly or wrongly, that they travel nearly as much as we do. Why they do not come to visit us we really cannot say, unless it be that, like most northern nations, their impulse is always to hurry to the sunny south. Why we pay their country such flying visits is more easily explained. The hotels are a disgrace to a civilized community. The *cuisine* in those establishments is so ludicrously bad, that to leave Rotterdam for Brussels is a real pleasure. Then the language appears at first singularly uncouth and disagreeable. It is difficult to realize that it has been illustrated by great authors, and that even now it is used by men of most distinguished ability in parliamentary debate, in the pulpit, and in the lecture-room. Further, although everybody with whom the traveller is likely to care to communicate, speaks either English, French, or German, there is always a sense of constraint in hearing a language spoken around us which we cannot follow. Lastly, we are absurdly ignorant about Holland, and not one traveller in ten, when he crosses its frontier, is aware that he is entering a country which, in more than one respect, is far in advance of his own.

Till recently there have been no books about the Netherlands published in any language which is familiar to any considerable number of Englishmen; now, however, there are two, from either of which they will get a fair general idea of the country. The first, and far the best, is "*La Neerlande et la vie Hollandaise*," by M. Esquiro, published originally in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* and since reprinted in two small volumes. The second, which is considerably larger, is by Dr. Albert Wild; its full title is, "*Die Niederlande, ihre Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*."

This book has been constructed on the basis of the work of Esquiro and of the accurate Guide of Baedeker; but it contains a modicum of valuable new matter. The author lived some time in Holland, and took much pains; he has, however, plundered his predecessors with far too little acknowledgment, and he has that delight in all vulgar and mean detail which is characteristic of the worst kind of German traveller, and makes him an exceedingly offensive, although useful, companion in a Dutch tour. Somewhat too much is generally made of the oddities of Holland. People go to see an exceptional place, a mere toy, like Broek, and suppose that all its absurdities are repeated up and down the land. This is

not the side of Dutch life to which we wish to call attention. Beckford and Andrew Marvell have said all that need be said on that subject, and Mr. Murray has duly reproduced their exceedingly good jokes for all English tourists.

Neither shall we linger amongst the pictures, though that would be a more tempting theme. For not only is the great collection at Amsterdam at least as well worth seeing as the more celebrated one at the Hague, but almost every wealthy family possesses, if not a gallery, yet a small collection of pictures, of real merit. The contemporary Dutch school is extremely respectable; and the numerous class in this country which buys pictures because it is the fashion to do so, would be much better employed in encouraging real excellence, on the other side of the water, than in stimulating the production of pre-Raphaelite monstrosities to affright the ages to come. Indeed, the taste for collecting can be better gratified in the Netherlands than in most places, or rather could be, for of late the prices of old china, old furniture, and so forth, has risen prodigiously.

Whatever pursuit it may be which draws the Englishman to Holland, he will soon find out that there is no European country in which his language is so generally spoken, and his literature so extensively read. Nowhere has Macaulay exercised so wide an influence. We have heard it said that not less than 100,000 copies of one or other of his works had found their way into circulation either in Dutch or English in that small country. The greatest of Dutch philosophers, Professor Opzoomer, of Utrecht, is now engaged in publishing an edition of the English text of Shakespeare, with Dutch notes. "Adam Bede" was translated by the wife of an eminent theologian, and there is hardly an educated household in which the novels of Mr. Kingsley are not read with avidity. Dean Milman is honoured at Leyden as much as he deserves to be; and we saw Dr. Davidson's second volume in a shop there, within a fortnight after its appearance.

Esquiro's begins his book by remarking that too often the traveller or the moralist neglects to reconstruct the physical theatre on which the different civilizations of Europe have developed themselves. It is said that an English writer, who is best known to the public as a man of science, was led by his study of antiquities to inquire into geology, and by geology to the speculations which have made him famous. This, which could only happen accidentally in Great Britain, would be perfectly natural in Holland. Till quite recent times, the chief history of that country is the history of great changes in the relations of land and water. The other events of the Dutch middle-age are insignificant by the side of the tremendous convulsions which created the Zuyder Zee and the Dollart, and made fish swim over the steeples of countless parishes.

Holland is the Egypt of Europe. Its wide and fertile meadows are the gift of the Rhine; but what the river gave, the sea has too often tried to take away, and the river is perpetually seeking to reclaim its own gift. We hardly realize to how great a danger our Dutch neighbours are constantly exposed, or how very important are the functions which are performed by the department of the State which is intrusted with the regulation of the waters. The king, long unpopular, has in the last year or two risen very much in the good graces of his people, on account of his spirited and sympathizing behaviour on the occasion of the last great inundation, which happened in 1861. If the storms which took place last December had coincided with a freshet in the Rhine, he might have had an opportunity of adding to his popularity. As it was, the water was in the lower stories of half the houses in Rotterdam, and the flood spread far and wide on either side the Maas.

The dykes, by which all the exposed parts of the coast are protected, are less striking to the eye of the unlearned than might be supposed. Even the mighty bulwark which defends North Holland—the great dyke of the Helder—has nothing imposing in its appearance, although it takes high rank amongst the most gigantic works of man. On the other hand, the ship-canal, which joins Amsterdam with the ocean, does not disappoint expectation. The canals of our own country look like mere threads of water as long as one retains the impression of its gigantic proportions. It is but the other day that the draining of the stormy and dangerous Haarlem Lake was finished, and now we begin to hear of proposals to reclaim the bed of the Zuyder Zee itself, and to open for the commerce of Amsterdam a new communication through the Y to the North Sea.

It is the strange and unusual appearance of the landscape and the great works by which the swampy delta of the Rhine is made fit for human habitation,—it is the wondrous network of canals,—the great cities, with their bustling quays and the Indiamen unloading before the doors of the merchants to whom they belong, which would, we think, most attract the notice of the passing

traveller; but what we wish to do is to induce some one to make a longer visit to Holland, and then to give us a work of importance on the following points, with regard to each of which we propose to jot down some hints in subsequent articles:—

First, the political condition of Holland and the steps by which it has arrived at its present distinguished position amongst free nations. Secondly, its religious sects, their relations and peculiarities. Thirdly, the state of education. Fourthly, the colonial question; and fifthly, the national literature.

LORD WROTTESELEY ON CHARITIES.

THE statesman with the courage to purge the Augean stable of public Charities, has not yet arisen. Five and forty years ago Henry Brougham, in the vigour of his early manhood, managed to get Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject, and the result of their inquiries fills a library of folio volumes. Since then some feeble attempts have been made to put an end to Charity abuses. But, in truth, they are perpetrated and maintained by men so thoroughly respectable and so well-to-do in the world, that the task is all but impossible. The value of the public Charities in this country is not less than £75,000,000. The larger portion of that sum was intended for the poor. But so gross has been the neglect or corruption of those who have had this property under their control, that the mass of it has been usurped by the upper and middle classes, or systematically applied to promote demoralising political bribery. Take the list of the towns, and even villages in England, and it will be found that there is scarcely one which does not possess some endowment for the benefit of the Poor. If the endowment is very small, it is too often wasted in bribing old men and women to come to church. If it is large, as is the case of Christ's Hospital, the revenues of which amount to £60,000 a year, it is appropriated to the children of the middle classes, who ought to be clothed and educated at the expense of their friends. If it be an hospital or an almshouse, the solicitor and the architect exercise a sort of prescriptive right to deduct some 30 per cent. out of the revenue for management and repairs; whilst in other cases some *faineant* clergyman, under the imposing title of Master, derives a comfortable income of £400 or £500 a year for professing his readiness to supply spiritual consolation to half a dozen old ladies and gentlemen. Any one who chooses to read the evidence of Mr. Hare or of Mr. Martin, both of them Charity Inspectors, published by the Education Commissioners, may satisfy himself of the gross abuses which even now attend the distribution of public Charity. And when it is remembered that a sum of £200,000 is annually wasted, it might seem clear that something ought to be done in the way of reform.

Hitherto all such attempts have proved fruitless. In the year 1853 a Charity Commission was appointed, with certain powers. But the gentlemen selected to fill the office of Commissioners were quite unequal to the task assigned to them. The chief was an eminent conveyancer, who had won his reputation in picking out flaws in title-deeds; the others were superannuated barristers. Had they been men of vigour, they might by this time have roused such a feeling in the public mind that some sweeping reform would have become imperative. The abuses are so gross that they cannot bear the light. The powers of inquiry vested in the Commissioners were ample—their powers of reforming abuses absolutely *nil*. But wherever there are charitable funds, there are persons who are dissatisfied with the mode in which they are distributed, and who are ready to demand inquiry. In all such cases, the Charity Commissioners should have dispatched their Inspector to the spot to make inquiry. In many cases this has no doubt been done, though it is known that in one of the most flagrant cases, the Inquiry which had been fixed was actually stopped in consequence of a representation made from a powerful quarter. But they should not have been satisfied with mere inquiry. They should have published the results of these inquiries. Instead of this, however, the Reports of the Inspectors have remained in manuscript, buried in the dust of some garret in the offices in St. James's-square. When the Education Commissioners attempted to obtain an account of these Inspectors' Reports, many of them were not forthcoming. Though the Charity Commissioners publish a so-called report once every year, it contains scarcely anything of general interest, and nothing whatever of the gross abuses which it is their duty to investigate and make public. The object of these Commissioners seems to be to do nothing—to avoid irritating local prejudices—and, in short, to lead a quiet life. The truth is, that for all practical purposes of reform, the present Charity Commission is absolutely useless. It was natural enough that at the original creation of such a board, some jealousy should be dis-

played, and that their powers should be restricted within narrow limits. But in ten years they ought to have gained for themselves public confidence, or, at all events, they ought to have furnished us with some information on the subject of the public Charities. Neither of these things have they done, or even attempted to do. Their timidity has been their destruction.

But matters cannot be allowed to remain as they are. Lord Granville, indeed, is not the man to lead a great reform, or to dare the obloquy of attempting to interfere with the comfort and ease of other men. He sets too high a value himself on such luxury. But Lord Wrottesley was quite right in saying that if nothing was done the lower classes of this country would have good reason to complain. It is but the other day that the wills of ancient founders, with all their absurd restrictions, were set aside for the benefit of the middle and upper classes in this country. The College Statutes of Oxford and Cambridge have been reformed, and young men excluded from the benefits of the original foundations have been admitted with the sanction of Parliament to those benefits. Upon what ground is the same principle inapplicable to the lower classes? If the changes have worked well in the case of the Universities, it may reasonably be supposed that they will work well in other cases. The poorer classes are quite as much entitled to the interference of Parliament as their wealthier and nobler brethren. And if this interference is withheld, it will be difficult to persuade the poor that it is withheld for any better reason than that it would disturb the usurpation of the upper classes over the property which really belongs to the poor.

There is, however, another view which ought to exert some influence on those who profess themselves financial economists. It is believed, upon the best authority, that, if the existing Charities were properly applied, they would go far to supply all the aid which is required to promote the education of the poor in this country. At present the means of education are supplied partly out of the Parliamentary grant, and it is an important fact that this Parliamentary aid is often furnished to the very places where the Charities are most abundant. Thus, one year's income of the Middlesex Charities, including London and Westminster, exceeds all the grants towards education in the same county during the last twenty-six years. Eighteen months' income of the Bedford charities would have supplied all the education grants to the same county during twenty-six years. In the wealthy county of Lancashire, which has received most money from the Education grant, the Charities amount to £35,222 a year; so that the whole annual Parliamentary grant might have been defrayed by half of this sum. So in Wales, it appears that the Parliamentary grant would have been met by applying little more than a half the sum of money devoted to doles, apprenticeships, and almshouses. Such being the state of things, it is surely a serious question how far Parliament is justified in making grants out of the Exchequer to promote education, seeing that there are already ample funds devoted to Charity which could be devoted to the Education of the Poor without depriving them of any real benefit.

It is, however, idle to suggest any improvement in the use of charities until some means are provided for carrying these improvements into practical effect. Grievously as the Charity Commissioners have failed, they ought not to be visited with censure for having failed to put new charitable schemes in operation. They could not do so of themselves, for they had no power. Their only course was to call in the aid of the Court of Chancery or Parliament. The Court of Chancery is the most unfit tribunal which can be imagined for remodelling obsolete or useless charities. It is not only expensive, but the judges who preside there are not fitted to discharge duties of this nature. Parliament is perhaps even more unfit. It seems to be impossible to get a Bill embodying any scheme through that assembly when there is the slightest opposition. As Sir G. Grey once told the Chief Commissioner, "You must select the bills which you think will receive any local opposition, and you must abandon them all."

It is absolutely essential, therefore, to construct some new tribunal, which shall have power to remodel charities at a moderate expense. Probably, the best plan is that suggested by the Education Commissioners. Retaining the present Charity Commission, which is chiefly composed of lawyers, it would become part of the Privy Council of Education; so that, in settling any new schemes, both these departments would be responsible, and would be able to bring their experience to bear in settling new schemes. And when it is remembered that a sum of £300,000 a year is actually devoted by the terms of the endowment to education, and that a sum of £200,000 in addition might be applied advantageously, the importance of connecting the Charity Commission with the Education Committee is obvious. The schemes thus settled would

be laid before Parliament, as in the case of the reformed statutes for Oxford and Cambridge, and unless appealed against in three months, would become law.

ENGLISH COMFORT.

No boast is more commonly made by Englishmen than the vaunt that they alone know what is meant by comfort. Metaphysics may be left to Germans, wit to France, and artistic skill to Italy; but the science of being comfortable is the special possession of England. Perhaps, however, not one in a hundred of those who use the word have formed any distinct notion as to what is really meant by the expression "comfortable." It is sufficiently clear that the term is wholly inapplicable to any high intellectual delight, or to any kind of enjoyment involving excitement. To hear a sonata of Beethoven's, to listen to an eloquent harangue, to become excited over a game, may each, in their way, be pleasant occupations enough; but none of them produce an effect which could be described as comfort. On the other hand, mere bodily pleasure, such as the drinking of good wine or the eating of well-cooked dinners, does not of itself produce the special feeling of which Englishmen believe themselves to have the monopoly. It will, on examination, be found that what is meant by comfort is a certain combination of physical well-being with mental satisfaction. To have your body thoroughly at ease, and to know that it is so, without being tormented by any care or pain which may take or may distract attention from the contemplation of your physical satisfaction, is the essence of comfort. Hence, a certain amount of drowsiness, or, at least, of intellectual quiescence, is essential to its existence. A dog basking by the fire, a father of a family filled with dinner, dignity, and complacency, warmed by his own hearth and resting in his own arm-chair, are the types of ideal comfort. What, therefore, is understood—as far as any definite meaning can be attached to the vaunts in which one nation parades its supposed superiority to others,—by the well-worn assertion that Britain is the land of comfort, is simply this; that the physical arrangements of life are so well ordered by Englishmen as to produce, more frequently than do the habits of other nations, that peculiar kind of enjoyment arising from the consciousness of physical ease.

It is hard to suppose that a nation can fancy itself possessed of exactly those qualities in which it is deficient. Still, in the mind of any critic, who takes a pleasure in trying the truth of popularly received doctrines, there must occur considerable difficulties in admitting the claims of Englishmen to the knowledge of what is comfortable. After all, there is nothing like bringing a specious generality to the test of comparison with particular facts, and it is easy enough to find points which will enable us to compare the degree in which foreigners and Englishmen succeed in making existence agreeable. Few Englishmen, it may be supposed, however patriotic, would care to stand up on behalf of certain of the social arrangements of their country. Evening parties—"at homes"—"drums"—formal calls, may all be institutions which possess a merit not to be perceived by careless observers, but they assuredly are not comfortable. To stand in a room where you are in the way of everybody and everybody else is in yours,—to pass an evening in boring others and being bored yourself,—to fritter away an afternoon in wasting the time of all your acquaintance, are, it may be, acts of salutary discipline, but assuredly the most uncomfortable of employments. Nor, again, would any prudent advocate wish to stake the ease of England upon the agreeableness of her places for public resort. The worst foreign town has in its *café* at least a place where, at no great expense, it is possible for any one away from home to pass his time, without absolute suffering. What a person in the same position is to do, even in London, it is difficult to say. Indeed, among the most miserable spectacles that the world offers, is the sight of a foreign traveller who has just had his dinner at a London eating-house. He asks plaintively of sympathetic strangers where he is to go. The waiters give obvious signs that, now he has eaten his fill of the joint, his room is decidedly more desirable than his company, and the hints of the servants are made the more forcible by the extreme unpleasantness of a room reeking with the smell of hot joints. The foreign gentleman excluded from a club, and with no acquaintance, not unnaturally longs for his *café*, and becomes somewhat sceptical about the agreeableness of life in England. He may, it will be said, go to the theatre. This resource he has if he is staying in the metropolis, and does not already know by heart the whole of that very limited number of plays with which managers for months together entertain the public. If he is in a country town, his case is desperate. A

theatre, indeed, exists; but it is of course shut up, or, if open, probably used as the scene of a missionary meeting. An Englishman, on the other hand, passing through a German town, finds that he is freed from half those discomforts which would inevitably overpower him if journeying through the minor cities of his own country. A good *café*, a tolerable theatre, opportunities of hearing music better than that provided even for educated audiences at home, enable travellers to pass a solitary evening without meditating on the advantages of suicide. Moreover, it should be remembered that—whilst in England all amusements are provided for the respectable, or, in other words, the rich portion of the community, and no man is supposed to deserve the least entertainment who cannot pay down a shilling,—pastimes are provided abroad for those who can afford nothing more than the price of a cup of coffee. Some people, indeed, may consider it a sort of crime to be deficient in shillings, just as others regard it as an offence to haunt the theatre, or to seek for any enjoyment out of the so-called “family circle.” Moralists of this order may derive a grim satisfaction from the thought that England provides no comforts for a quasi-criminal population. But though the full force of this plea be granted, it will still be found that the English promise of comfort often breaks down when there is no excuse for failure. No nation travels so much as Englishmen, nor can it be said that travelling is tainted with the least slur of disreputability. Moreover, almost the whole pleasantness of a journey turns on the existence of arrangements for the physical well-being of travellers. In these, if in anything, Englishmen might be expected to excel. In no department of life, however, do they fail more lamentably. A foreign artisan journeys in conveyances more comfortable than the second-class carriages, in which are to be found the mass of the busy or holiday-making population; whilst the places ironically called refreshment-rooms, which at Wolverton or Swindon offer an unwholesome diet of stale buns or suspicious pork-pies, are too bad even for comparison with the little buffets scattered at short intervals over all the railroads of France and Germany. Prussians, though not supposed to be quick at inventions, have contrived a device, which triumphantly disposes of one of the minor difficulties of English journeys. Any one who happens to desire a cup of tea or coffee finds that even when he at last seems likely to obtain the object of his wishes, he has still, before he can quench his thirst, to solve an almost insoluble problem. How can he drink his tea hot within the space of three minutes? As a matter of fact, only a courageous fraction succeed in accomplishing the feat, and rows of scarcely tasted cups testify the general failure. Some ingenious German, who ought particularly to be commended to the notice of Mr. Gladstone, has invented a paper cup, which will completely hold a draught of the hottest liquid, and can be bought for a farthing. By means of this invention, the good people of Berlin take up and drink at their ease, as they go along the railroad, the cups of coffee which comfort-loving Englishmen find it impossible to swallow without scalding their throats.

Patriots, driven to confess that English theatres, hotels, refreshment rooms, and railways, cannot be termed comfortable, will probably take their stand upon the comfort of English homes. Here, if anywhere, the great national quality is to be found in perfection. It takes some heroism to muster up courage sufficient to attack the last stronghold of national prejudice. When men have rallied round their homes and hearths they are apt to grow desperate, and must be treated with respect. We are willing, therefore, to concede that the family comfort of Englishmen is unquestionable; that husband and wife never disagree and never seek for divorce; that children are always respectful, and brothers and sisters always affectionate; and that, to add the crown to family comfort, the home circle, which is always admirable, is never dull. But when we have conceded that the moral comfort of home life must be placed beyond dispute, a daring scepticism may be allowed to question whether the physical arrangements of English houses are absolutely perfect. An open fireplace, it may be granted, is more pleasant to look at than a stove, though Germans think the superiority of a stove indubitable, and the beauty of a wood fire can never be forgotten by those who have had the opportunity of seeing it; but even of open fires it is possible to have too much; and a large dinner party assembled in a small room, seated with their backs to a furnace, which the hospitality of the host has heated sevenfold hotter than its wont, presents the most vivid picture of purgatory which human experience affords. Rooms, indeed, are often small in other countries, but the custom, which requires each man to have a separate house and each apartment a separate fireplace, produces rooms smaller and hotter than are used by the miserable and degraded foreigners who delight in stoves and

flats. Still we are loath to believe our national boast to be entirely unfounded. It may be the effect of a partiality for one's own country which no philosophy can cure; but we are inclined to think that candid observers will confess the vaunt of English comfort to have this, if no other foundation, that Englishmen possess better coals, and make more lavish use of water than any other European nation.

THE PAST WEEK.

On Friday week, in the House of Lords, Lord Llanover put a question as to the intention of the Government about carrying out the recommendations in the report of the Commissioners on the state of the Volunteer force. Earl De Grey and Ripon, after several noble lords had spoken, said perhaps there would be other patterns selected for volunteers' uniforms in addition to the single grey pattern, but those who were in receipt of Government aid in clothing would be confined to certain definite regulation patterns. In the House of Commons, Mr. Layard gave explanations respecting the differences between her Majesty's Government and that of Brazil. On the report on the Address, Mr. Bentineck, speaking of the cession of the Ionian Islands, questioned whether we should derive any great military advantage from the possession of Corfu. He thought, regarding the American war, a change of feeling had taken place recently respecting it in England, and he considered it tant to say that slavery was the real cause of contention. Mr. Locke wanted to know what had been done in the manufacturing districts to take advantage of the Act of last session respecting a rate in aid. Mr. Newdegate complained of the weight with which the French treaty had fallen upon his constituency, and he had a doubt whether the treaty with Belgium, in connection with the 5th article of the French treaty, might not injure our interests. After various members had enunciated opinions rather discursively, the report was agreed to. Mr. Herbert alluded to the removal of Irish paupers from England to Ireland, under the provisions of the Act 24 and 25 Viet. He spoke of irregularities to which Irish paupers had been subjected in removal. Mr. Villiers could give no explanation as to the alleged irregularities. The Poor-Law Board was irresponsible for dereliction of duty on the part of persons who were called upon to execute the law. Mr. Whalley moved for leave to introduce a bill for reducing the expenses of passing bills relating to railways. A discussion ensued, in which Mr. Milner Gibson said he did not think the House would consent to part with any of its powers without due deliberation. Leave was given to introduce the bill. Permission was given to Sir John Trelawny to bring in a bill to abolish church-rates. Mr. Hadfield and Mr. Dillwyn obtained leave to introduce new bills on minor subjects.

In the House of Lords, on Monday, little other business than bringing up her Majesty's answer to their Lordships' Address, was transacted. In the House of Commons, Mr. Hennessy failed to raise a discussion on the affairs of Poland. Sir G. Grey obtained leave to introduce a bill to amend and continue the law relating to corrupt practices at elections. It was agreed that the responsibility of preparing estimates of the charge of the disembodied militia of Great Britain and Ireland be undertaken in future by Ministers of the Crown, in lieu of appointing a select committee. Leave was given to Sir R. Peel to bring in a bill for the Registration of Births and Deaths in Ireland. A motion made by Mr. H. Seymour for the re-appointment of the Select Committee to inquire into the present state of the Ecclesiastical Commission, was agreed to. A conversation on Tuesday evening took place in the House of Lords on the ticket-of-leave system. Lord Carnarvon commented rather severely on the Home-office administration. Leave was given on the same evening to Sir J. Trelawny to introduce a bill in the House of Commons, allowing persons to make affirmations in all cases where an oath is required. Mr. Alcock and Sir G. Bowyer obtained leave to introduce bills—the former for voluntary redemption of church-rates, the latter to amend the law regarding the jurisdiction exercised by the benchers of the four inns of court in England, in certain cases. Lord Palmerston, in replying to Mr. Hennessy, said no proposition was made by Austria during the Crimean war to England and France, to assist in forming a separate kingdom in Poland.

There was no sitting of the House of Lords on Wednesday. In the Commons a discussion ensued on the order for the second reading of the Salmon Fisheries' (Ireland) Bill. An amendment was proposed by Mr. Butt, and was afterwards withdrawn. The bill was read a second time. Mr. Newdegate had leave given him to introduce a bill to establish a charge in lieu of church-rates for the commutation thereof, and to afford facilities for the provision of other funds applicable to the purposes of the church-rates. Lord Raynham is to introduce a bill for the prevention of aggravated assaults on women and children.

In Thursday's sitting of the Corps Legislatif, the amendment proposed by M. Jules Favre to paragraph 2 of the address was rejected. The amendment to the address in favour of Poland was then discussed, and was brought forward by M. Guyard Delalain, who wished to learn whether it was intended to restore the Constitution granted by the Emperor Alexander. He was followed by M. Jules Favre, who spoke in favour of Poland; but M. Billault contended that the present was an inopportune moment for discussing the question of Poland, though France did not lack sympathy for her, neither did the French Government, and he

thought Poland might expect more from the liberal sentiments of the Emperor of Russia than from insurrectionary movements. On Saturday, in the Corps Legislatif, the debate on Mexico was resumed by M. Billault replying to M. Jules Favre; he maintained that France had cause of complaint against the Government of Juarez, which had "broken its sworn faith." France was resolved, like England, to make its countrymen everywhere respected. He repudiated the doctrine of M. Jules Favre, that the Government had shown a want of foresight in reference to the Mexican expedition. He protested against rumours that scandalous and secret speculations lay behind French intervention in Mexico. M. Jules Favre maintained that the Minister sought to distort the question when he submitted that the expedition was only undertaken in defence of the national honour; and that the acts put forward as forming motives for the expedition could not be imputed to Juarez, as many of them were committed before his government succeeded to power. The amendment to the address relative to Mexico was rejected. In the Chamber of Deputies, M. Billault has replied to the speech of M. Favre respecting Rome. The policy, he said, of France towards Italy was neither powerless nor equivocal; and France could not suffer to see the Pope a slave. France required tranquillity upon her frontiers, and she would prefer a federation of Italian States; but did not wish to raise any opposition to the unity of Italy. Was Rome, he inquired, necessary to Italy? To France, Rome represented one of the foundations of the independence of the Holy See; Rome as the capital of Italy was of secondary importance to France. France had never promised Rome to the Italians. The political and religious interests of France were opposed to the abandonment of Rome. M. Billault alluded to what he called the uncertain attitude of England in the beginning of the French occupation of Rome. In 1860, England made propositions by accepting which the French would have left Rome, and Austria would have remained mistress of Italy. Were the French to leave Rome the Pope might ask assistance of Austria, and France would not be in a position to offer opposition. Italy had two courses open to her—an appeal to revolution, or to lean upon France while perfecting her organization; but the Emperor would continue to labour to effect a reconciliation with the Pope and Italy. The paragraph in the address referring to Rome was passed.

We have received intelligence by the *Damascus* from New York to the 27th of January, from which it appears that General Burnside has resigned the command of the army of the Potomac, and his successor is General Hooker. General Burnside in his letter of resignation says that under circumstances more fortunate the army would have accomplished greater results. Unfavourable weather retarded any onward movement of the army of the Potomac. It is stated that the Federals in North Carolina, under General Foster, have made no advanced movement. Land forces on the 16th had been sent towards the railroad, and 1,300 Confederates had been met at Pollocksville. From an engagement the Confederates were driven back with the loss of a flag. A Confederate steamer, after a severe contest, sunk the Federal gunboat *Hatteras*, off Galveston. Engagements with the Federal gunboats took place on the 14th, at Bayouche, Louisiana, and the Federal commander was killed. The Finance Bill, emanating from the Committee of Ways and Means, passed the House of Representatives. By the *Hibernia* we have news relating chiefly to successes in the south-west of the Federals. M'Clelland's expedition was on the Louisiana side of the Mississippi, in view of Vicksburg. The Federals have destroyed the Confederate iron-clad steamer *Catton*, in Bayouche. A resolution has been introduced in the Jersey Legislature that the people are discouraged by reverses for which the generals are not responsible, and that the only means to save the country are by restoring to power General M'Clelland, who is now in Boston, receiving great attention. The proposal in Congress to place him at the head of the army was hailed with applause from the galleries. The *Tribune* says that the French Minister denies being implicated in any scheme to bring about intervention.

A very serious poaching affray occurred on the night of the 6th instant, on the estate of General Hall, at Weston Colville, Cambridgeshire. The head gamekeeper, named Tilbrook, was out with an assistant watcher of the name of Hart. Shots were heard, and the game-watchers discovered three poachers, armed, in one of the preserves. In an attempt to capture the poachers Tilbrook was fired at by one of the party and a part of his face blown away. Joseph Biggs has been apprehended on suspicion of being one of the offenders, and upon him were found seventeen bullets; he had also a wound in the loins, sustained during the conflict with the keepers. Tilbrook remains in a dangerous state. On the same night, a desperate affray between gamekeepers and poachers took place in the preserves of Annesley, a few miles from Nottingham, belonging to Mr. J. C. Musters. Four gamekeepers were watching, and discovered nine or ten poachers setting nets and beating for game. Attempts were made to capture the poachers, who, seeing their danger, began throwing stones, and being armed with bludgeons, forks, and stakes, a close encounter with the keepers commenced, and much personal injury was the result. One of the men, named Gelsthorpe, was apprehended, and with his head bandaged and clothes saturated with blood, was taken before the county bench of magistrates and remanded.

Respecting the reception to be given to the Princess Alexandra on her arrival in London on the 7th March, a deputation, consisting of the Lord Mayor, Mr. Anderton, and the City Remembrancer, had an interview on Saturday with Sir George Grey at the

Home Office. The route to be taken will be from the Bricklayers' Arms station through the Borough over London-bridge, through King William-street, by the Mansion House, the Poultry, Cheap-side, St. Paul's-churchyard, Ludgate-hill, Fleet-street, the Strand, and on to the Great Western Railway at Paddington. The precise hour at which her Royal Highness the Princess will arrive is not yet known; in the meantime the South Eastern Railway Company have determined as far as they can to give the greatest *éclat* to the proceedings at their stations—the Bricklayers' Arms and Gravesend. The train intended to convey the bridal party and their respective suites has been taken in hand to be thoroughly beautified, and the engine that is to draw the train will bear the British and Danish flags. On the part of Mr. Commissioner Harvey and Sir R. Mayne efforts will be made to prevent the traffic of the streets impeding the procession. Various military corps will line the thoroughfares of the city. The Mansion House is to be gaily decorated, and seats for a limited number of persons in the balconies will be provided. No doubt the loyalty of the citizens of London will add greatly to the rejoicings by a display of flags and other emblems of goodwill. Steps are being taken in nearly all the provincial towns, great and small, for celebrating the day of the marriage in a manner worthy of the occasion.

The Polish insurrection is far from being quelled. Under date, Warsaw, February 7, we hear of a great battle fought near Wousock, and the defeat of the insurgents. From Breslau it is reported that Sosnowice—a town on the Russian frontier, opposite Kaltowitz, the seat of a Custom-house—had been taken, after a sanguinary conflict, by the insurgents. The *Schwäbische Zeitung* says, on the 8th, that matters in Poland are so serious that a battalion of Russian infantry had been forwarded to the frontier by special train from Oppelen. The *Breslauer Zeitung* has a telegram from Myslowitz, saying that fugitive Russian troops were arriving there on the 7th instant, in very large numbers, 500 of whom, however, had been disarmed. From Lemberg there comes intelligence that 6,000 insurgents, under the command of Baron Heidel, have been beaten by the Russian General Mack, near Wousock. Two battalions of peasants threw down their arms immediately on being attacked; many of the insurgents are wandering in the forests, while the Russians have set fire to the town of Wousock. News from Cracow, of the 8th instant, relates that the insurgents were daily augmenting their forces, and that the Polish portion of the Warsaw and Vienna Railway was in their power. Three thousand of them were in the neighbourhood of Myslowitz. The National Government of Sandomir has been suspended. The *Breslauer Zeitung* of the 7th gives news from Beuthen of the 6th, from which it appears, that Prussian troops had been despatched from that town to Seimanowitz, because the insurgents had much increased at the Polish frontier town of Czelacz. It is said the insurgents have invaded the Prussian territory near Sublinitz. The *Journal de St. Petersburg*, of the 7th, reports that Wengrow had been taken by the Russian troops after a desperate conflict. An attempt to poison the Marquis de Wielopolski has been made. The family of the Marquis and his servants are seriously ill in consequence; the poison was mixed in the provisions of the family. The prorogation of the Galician Diet has been proclaimed by the Emperor of Austria; this step has been adopted because Prince Sapiha had signified his intention of proposing that the Diet should vote an address to the Emperor, requesting his diplomatic intercession with the Emperor of Russia in favour of Poland. From Myslowitz and Beuthen on Sunday and Monday, the insurgents are reported as being unchecked; in Beuthen the great landed proprietors were assisting the insurgents with horses and provisions. From Berlin intelligence has been conveyed, that the insurrectionary movement is spreading, and great excitement prevails in Kulm among the Polish landed proprietors. News from Lemberg, of the 10th inst., describe the defeat of the insurgents by the Russians in various districts. Rumours from Berlin set forth that some parts of Western Prussia are to be declared in a state of siege. From Warsaw and Wilna intelligence comes of the defeat of the insurgents. News from Lemberg, of the 11th, describes the discomfiture of the insurgents in various parts, and the entrance of 2,000 Russian infantry and 200 Cossacks into Sandomir unopposed.

A correspondence relating to the Pope, emanating from Earl Russell to Mr. Odo Russell, has been issued, and is of much importance, because clearly indicating the views of her Majesty's Government on the occupation of Rome by French troops, and the position of his Papal Holiness. Earl Russell's first letter is dated Foreign-office, October 25, 1862, and begins by alluding to the correspondence of the Emperor of the French in the *Moniteur* of September, in which it was pointed out that great evils flowed from the present aspect of affairs in Rome. The Emperor called the attention of the Pope to the fact that while everything that was liberal in Europe condemned the resistance of his Holiness to every proposal of arrangement, the most attached adherents of the See of Rome found their consciences troubled by the antagonism between their "political convictions and religious principles which would seem to condemn modern civilization." Earl Russell then proceeds to comment on the conduct of his Holiness—that he allowed his spiritual authority to be impaired by his resistance to the wishes of the Italian people. On the part of her Majesty's Government, Earl Russell maintains that, in opposition to the picture drawn of his Holiness by the most eminent of his own Church, his territory had become a refuge for one of the contending parties, and the name of religion had been used as a justification for civil war. Conflicts of a ferocious kind were seen to take place under the pretence of their necessity to vindicate the temporal power of the

Pope. Her Majesty's Government were of opinion that Rome should be the capital of the Italian Kingdom; but they had been informed that the Pope believed a time would come when his lost territories would be restored to him and his temporal power regain its former splendour. It is then asked, whether instead of the Pope being himself the principal cause of the civil war in Italy he should not retire and expect in tranquillity the issue which in the order of Providence may await the Papacy or determine the fate of Italy. Had his Holiness thought proper to retire, the Admiral of her Majesty in the Mediterranean would have conveyed him to Malta, to Trieste, to Marseilles, or to Valencia, and in Malta a mansion suitable for him would have been provided. There he would have been surrounded, if he had chosen, by his chief cardinals and trusty counsellors. Civil war, it was conjectured, would then subside in Italy, and the Italian people would be at liberty either to enjoy the complete possession of their own territory or again assign to the Pope, if they thought fit, a temporal dominion. In a letter to Earl Cowley, Earl Russell states that the wishes of the Italians could not be carried out because for thirteen years French troops had prevented any freedom of choice on the part of the Romans; at the present time the people were less reconciled to the rule of their Sovereign than before, and the English Government thought that the foreign occupation should end; although the French Emperor had conceived the design of reconciling the Pope with Italy, they could not share in his expectation. Earl Cowley, in acknowledging the letter of Earl Russell, said he communicated the nature of it to M. Drouyn de Lhuys, who remarked that the views of the Emperor Napoleon and the English Government were, he thought, quite irreconcilable, but his Majesty looked ardently for the time when he could withdraw his troops from Rome with honour. On the 11th of November Mr. Odo Russell wrote to Earl Russell that he would visit Cardinal Antonelli and read to him his lordship's despatch. Mr. Russell subsequently learnt from the Cardinal that the Pope was disposed to remain in Rome so long as he could do so with advantage to the spiritual welfare of the Church; he thanked her Majesty's Government for their intentions, but he could not share their opinions.

Occasionally some rather singular evidence is given in trials for breaches of promise of marriage. A remarkable case has been heard in the Court of Exchequer, promoted by a Miss Russell, daughter of a surgeon named Russell, who died some years ago in Dublin, against Mr. Adams, surgeon, of Henrietta-street, Cavendish-square. The principal and only witness for the plaintiff was her mother, who, in reply to the cross-examination of defendant's counsel, became rather petulant. Mrs. Russell stated that when her husband died she began teaching music, and that plaintiff was her only daughter. She and plaintiff went some time ago to reside at the house of Mr. Crump, at Hornsey, and on one occasion, when having the charge of a child of Mr. Crump's, at the Orthopædic Hospital, made the acquaintance of defendant. Mrs. Russell stated that defendant promised her daughter marriage, and at his request expensive apartments were engaged in London, where he visited daily. A painful disclosure took place; Mrs. Russell found that Mr. Adams was already a married man, instead of an attractive bachelor; therefore an action was instituted. The reply to the charge on behalf of defendant was that no promise had ever been made, and that the whole affair was a conspiracy, and that defendant only saw the fatherless and fair plaintiff in a professional capacity. Several witnesses contradicted strongly Mrs. Russell's testimony. The case occupied nearly three days, and resulted in a verdict for defendant, as the jury said the plaintiff had not made out her case to their entire satisfaction.

Advices to New York from Vera Cruz, to the 9th ult., state that it was rumoured that General Legrate, with 10,000 Mexicans, had made a sortie from Puebla, and routed a French division of 14,000 men, slaughtering 2,000 of them. Rumour says, that the French fired upon each other when surprised in a fog by 8,000 Mexican cavalry at Rio Seco. Another rumour says that Puebla had surrendered to the French.

Convocation met on Tuesday, and in consequence of the accession of a new Archbishop, an opening with all due ceremonial accompanying the meeting, after an election, took place in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Four prisoners under remand have made their escape cleverly from a recently-erected lock-up in Derby.

The case of Clare against the Queen, which commenced early last week, terminated on Friday, the 6th inst. The plaintiff sued for damages for an infringement of his patent by the Admiralty, in constructing the *Warrior*, *Black Prince*, and other vessels; and further for a breach of contract in not paying him 5 per cent. for all ships built on his plans. The case occupied five days in hearing, and excited much interest among ship-builders. The jury found that the patent had not been infringed, i.e., in the construction of the hull; that plaintiff's specifications did not show longitudinal and vertical framing separate from the plates; and the question of novelty they desired to be excused from answering. The verdict of the jury was therefore entered for the Crown.

The treaty with Denmark for the marriage of the Prince of Wales to the Princess Alexandra has been published. The usual declarations are made of the consent of both Royal houses to the approaching marriage, and that the ceremony is to take place in Great Britain, according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England. Her Britannic Majesty engages that the Prince of Wales shall secure to the Princess Alexandra, out of any revenues of his Royal Highness, or guaranteed to their

Royal Highnesses by Parliament, the sum of £10,000 annually, to be paid half-yearly to her Royal Highness the Princess Alexandra for her sole and separate use; and in case of her Royal Highness becoming a widow, her Britannic Majesty engages further to recommend Parliament to pay the annual sum of £30,000 sterling to her Royal Highness in lieu of dower, and the above sum to be paid in quarterly instalments.

T. B. Rae, secretary to the Marylebone Board of Guardians, has become a defaulter in his accounts, and is now in custody. He was found to be *minus* a sum of money, and when interrogated admitted that he had appropriated £670 belonging to the parish to his own use. With the assistance of friends, prisoner said he could make up the defalcation in a week. This was unheeded, as the Guardians felt called upon to prosecute; and on Saturday, at the Marylebone Police-court, prisoner was charged with the offence, and remanded for a week.

The decision of the Duke of Coburg has now been made known respecting the vacant Crown of Greece. For several reasons, his Royal Highness has positively refused to allow his name to be put forward as a candidate for the Hellenic throne. This will give rise to new anxieties among the Greeks.

At the weekly meeting in Manchester of the Central Relief Committee for Lancashire distress, Mr. Farnall reported a continued diminution of paupers in the cotton districts. Mr. Farnall said it was generally believed that the operatives will probably be but half employed during the year, therefore it was important that other spheres of labour should be sought.

At Mountain Ash, near Aberdare, on Saturday, a colliery explosion took place, and thirteen men were at first reported "missing;" but only two have been killed.

Another ballet-girl, named Neilson, has met with an accident at Sadlers' Wells Theatre, by her clothes taking fire. The poor girl ran screaming across the stage, and was rather severely burnt before the flames were extinguished. She is likely to recover.

Mr. Powell, Conservative, has been returned M.P. for Cambridge, by a rather large majority.

A telegram from Lisbon of the 8th inst. says, that an English steamer had insulted a Portuguese steamer in the port of Angola, but that the English commander gave satisfaction on the following day.

An election will shortly take place at Devizes, owing to the death of Captain Gladstone, who has represented the borough since 1852. Deceased was the brother of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and was throughout his career a steady supporter of Conservative principles.

A vacancy at the end of the present session will be created in the representation of the city of Dublin, by the retirement of Sir E. Grogan.

Between seventy and eighty carpenters employed in preparations for the Royal wedding at the Chapel Royal of St. George, Windsor, struck for an advance of wages from 4s. 2d. per diem to 4s. 6d., and have obtained a promise that their terms shall be complied with.

On Saturday, General Serrano, acting for Marshal O'Donnell, who is ill, read a royal decree at Madrid, suspending the sittings of the Cortes. This step in Madrid has created some consternation, and a belief prevails that a dissolution of the Congress will follow. The Government, it is said, desires to unite by a conciliatory policy all the divisions of the liberal party. The Queen declares her confidence in Marshal O'Donnell. The Minister of Justice has resigned. France, it is said, has asked Spain to send back troops to Cochinchina, and that Spain has replied that she will respect the treaty which she has made with that country. Later accounts speak of Marshal O'Donnell's health as improving.

The *George Griswold*, laden with contributions for the Lancashire Distress Fund, entered the Mersey on Monday, and was hailed with a discharge of artillery. The cargo of the vessel comprise 13,236 barrels of flour, 315 boxes of bread, 50 barrels of pork, 167 bags of corn, 175 barrels of bread, 102 boxes of bacon, 3 tierces of rice, and two bags of rice.

A serious accident has occurred at the Bow extension of the Blackwall Railway, by a truck of a heavy goods-train running off the metals. Several other trucks were thrown off the metals and dragged along by the engine in fearful confusion. A part of the permanent way was torn up, and a quantity of brickwork destroyed.

An accident has befallen the Duke of Rutland. His Grace was out hunting near Grantham, and his horse fell in taking a brush fence, pitching the Duke on his head and shoulders. He was taken up insensible having sustained much injury.

Her Majesty has arrived at Windsor Castle from Osborne.

A letter has been published from President Lincoln, dated Washington, January 19, 1863, addressed to the working men of Manchester, in reply to an address to resolutions sent to the President on New Year's eve. The President says, when he went through a constitutional election in 1861 he found his country on the verge of civil war. His duty was to maintain the integrity of the Federal Republic. Circumstances had induced him to expect that if justice and good faith should be practised by the United States they would encounter no hostile influence from Great Britain. He was pleased to find that the working men of Manchester wished that peace and amity towards America should prevail. The utterances of the Manchester men had exhibited the inherent power of truth, and of the ultimate and universal triumph of justice, humanity, and freedom. The President concludes his letter, by saying that this interchange of sentiment he regards as an augury that the peace and friendship now

existing between England and America would be perpetual, and he should labour to that end.

The season of railway meetings has commenced, many of the principal companies having held their half-yearly meetings.

From the west coast of Africa the steam-ship *Macgregor* has arrived bringing twenty-seven passengers, and 2,801 ounces of gold dust. 200 houses have been destroyed at Lagos by a large fire. The negro King of Cape Coast Castle is reported dead.

A meeting to support the Emancipation policy of the American Government has been held in a chapel in the Commercial Road, Whitechapel. The Rev. C. Stovel, the minister of the chapel, proposed a resolution strongly condemnatory of slavery, and disapproving of European intervention. He spoke of the effrontery of men who said that slavery was sanctioned by the Bible. In the Jewish times he would admit that the Scriptures recognised a condition of subordinate servitude, but there was nothing in that akin to the ingredients of which American slavery was formed. The resolution was passed, after being supported by a speech from Mr. W. Wilks.

Lord Ravensworth, in the House of Lords, on Thursday, dwelt on the necessity of affording asylums to ships and seamen when caught in a gale, and he thought the present a good time for attending to the subject, as there was a surplus in the revenue. The Duke of Somerset opposed the creation of various harbours of refuge before the four great harbours at Dover, Alderney, Holyhead, and Portland were completed. He disagreed with having new ports paid for by public money. The subject dropped through. A conversation arose about Redpath, the forger, who is now in Western Australia, and the Duke of Newcastle said the convict resided in a house of his own, and received a remittance annually of £200 from his wife, who is in England.

Mr. Villiers, in the House of Commons, moved for leave to bring in a bill to extend for a further period the provisions of the Union Relief Aid Act of last session. Boards of Guardians viewed the Act as one of value, and the reason why it had not been used to the extent it might have been in the cotton districts was owing to the handsome voluntary contributions received for Lancashire from all parts of the empire. In replying to remarks by Lord Stanley, Mr. Cobden said that, assuming the present state of things to continue, the condition of the cotton districts would be more serious next winter than during the present. Details were given of the large voluntary contributions which had come from the districts themselves, besides poor-rates, loss of wages, and depreciation of capital, making an aggregate of £12,445,000. Leave was given to introduce the bill.

Sir William Armstrong has sent in his resignation of the position he has held for several years past of ordnance engineer and superintendent of rifled ordnance construction to the War Department. Sir William has only tendered his resignation that he may be enabled to attend more closely to the Elswick Ordnance Company, in which he has a large interest.

The election at Devonport has resulted in the return of Mr. Ferrand, Conservative. Great excitement prevailed among the people during the proceedings.

The overland mail has brought news from India, China, and Australia. Lady Elgin reached Calcutta on the 8th of January. Through a disturbance between the Ranee Wudjee and her son, about 200 men had been killed at Khettooree, in Central India. The rebels in China still hold Nankin. From Queensland news comes of the safe arrival there of Miss Rye and her female emigrants.

The Prince of Wales has taken up his freedom of the Worshipful Company of Fishmongers. The freedom was inclosed in a gold box.

Another inquest has been held on a young lady whose clothes caught fire through her crinoline. She was attending a few days ago to her mother, who was unwell, and when stooping near the fire, her clothes became ignited, and she was so severely burnt that she died two or three days after the accident.

Arrests in Paris are reported in consequence of intended demonstrations in favour of Poland. A large number of young men belonging to the normal schools and to the faculties of jurisprudence and medicine took part in the demonstration when leaving the public lectures.

Reviews of Books.

FARRAR'S BAMPTON LECTURES.*

It is much to be wished that the University of Oxford, among its other reforms, would make some alteration in its present system of Bampton Lectures. Most of our readers are aware that the Rev. John Bampton, in 1751, left certain estates for the endowment of "eight divinity lecture-sermons to be preached in St. Mary's Church by a lecturer, chosen by the heads of colleges only, on certain specified subjects, with the object of confirming the Christian faith and confuting all heretics and schismatics." Now, we do not say that, as at present constituted, these lectures have not been productive of good: there is no need to refer to well-known and really able treatises, the publication of which the

Bampton endowment has given rise to. This has been the case especially in the last few years. The lectures delivered by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Mansel made no inconsiderable stir in the theological world both of England and the Continent, and constitute valuable additions to Christian philosophy. At the same time, every one who reads Bampton Lectures, and, still more, every one who hears them, cannot but feel that they lose much by being compelled to take the form of a "lecture-sermon," and to submit to the very minute provisions of the founder's will. To mention only some of the disadvantages: the terms of the said will have to be considerably strained even to admit many of the subjects, the discussion of which has been of the greatest value. Then, whatever be the subject, its treatment must be compressed into eight lectures, neither more nor less, and must be printed almost exactly as delivered. Besides, the lectures must be preached at a particular time from the pulpit of St. Mary's, and so must assume some properties of a sermon in the shape of a text, practical lessons, occasional flourishes of rhetoric, adaptations to the spirit and tone of an academical, and, for the most part, a clerical audience. Now, although the subjects specified by the founder might admit of the sermon style well enough, some of those chosen by later lecturers, however excellent in themselves, are eminently unsuited to it. We recollect hearing that undergraduates used to flock to Mr. Mansel's lectures because, in the way of logic, they were so "good for the schools." Possibly, a similar motive as regards history might have influenced some of Mr. Rawlinson's audience. By this sort of lecture the pulpit can gain nothing, and the subject may often lose much. It would, we think, be far more satisfactory, and the purpose of the founder would be equally answered, if, instead of a series of "lecture-sermons to be preached," the University (imitating in some degree the example of the French Institute) were annually to put forth, under its sanction, a written treatise on some subject connected with Christianity, not only to be chosen by the author, but to be handled at whatever length and in whatever form he may deem best. Many a valuable monograph, we venture to say, would thus be produced by clerical or lay thinkers; indeed, we should expect to derive all the benefits of the present system undiminished by its inherent disadvantages.

If this idea had not occurred to any one before, it might be suggested by a perusal of this course of Bampton Lectures by Mr. Farrar. The subject is an excellent one, though hardly coming under those enumerated by the founder; much erudition and careful study are shown throughout in its treatment; but every reader must feel that the work would have been done much better if it had been independent of the pulpit altogether. While the greatest portion of these lectures reads just like so many pages of a literary review, we must acknowledge that those parts are very superior to others, which contain the practical conclusions, the lessons and warnings, the monotonous exhortations to "study" and "prayer," the apologies for candour (!) in the examination of his subject, which, we presume, were considered necessary to invest the discussion with the character of a "sermon-lecture."

"A Critical History of Free Thought in reference to the Christian Religion" is a topic interesting enough to induce us to lay before our readers a brief sketch of the way in which it has been handled by Mr. Farrar. By "free thought" he would mean "the resistance of the human mind to the Christian religion as communicated through revelation, either in part or in whole; either the scepticism which disintegrates it, or the unbelief which rejects it;" while the stand-point of criticism is the only one that could well be adopted by a university preacher, the "teaching of Scripture as expressed in the dogmatic teaching of the creeds of the Church." The causes, then, of the insurrection of mind against authority, of reason against revelation, being two-fold, moral and intellectual, Mr. Farrar selects the latter for investigation, with only occasional reference to the former, Bishop Van Mildert having, though from a peculiar point of view, discussed these in his Boyle Lectures of 1802-4.

The principal intellectual causes, as considered by our author, which make thought develop into doubt or unbelief are—(1) new materials of knowledge, such as the results of physical or metaphysical science, which may present truth and furnish conclusions opposed to the teaching of Scripture; (2) new methods of criticism and new grounds of belief, the application of which creates opinions differing from those of the traditional faith: as, for instance, when the doctrines of revelation are submitted to the particular tests, predominant or exclusive, of sense or reason, intuition or feeling. Such being the causes, their influence is traced in the four great epochs that have most signally exhibited the struggle of reason against the authority of the Christian religion.

The earliest of these periods, comprising the first four centuries, we may pass over hastily, as, however interesting may be the forms and sources of doubt or disbelief in such opponents of Christianity as Lucian, Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, they illustrate but very imperfectly, if at all, the intellectual causes assigned for such mental states by Mr. Farrar, in his first lecture. The second period is that between 1100 and 1400, when the Christian faith is viewed in its struggle with the sceptical tendencies exhibited by Scholasticism. The data for this epoch are not copious; but the lecturer has succeeded in tracing what vestiges he can find of free thought in respect of religion during these centuries to the new method and spirit of criticism introduced by the Nominalists, with Abelard for their representative, and to the disposition awakened by the scholastic movement in general to make dogmas submit to the test of reason. We doubt if Mr. Farrar has not attached more importance than is due to the contact with Mahometan life and

* A Critical History of Free Thought in reference to the Christian Religion. Bampton Lectures for 1862. By Adam Storey Farrar, M.A., Michel Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. London: John Murray. 1862.

opinion prevalent at this period, as imparting a latitude and a nascent incredulity to Christian thought; he has more reason for concluding, from the appearance of the book called the "Everlasting Gospel," and the excitement it caused, that the new idea of the progressiveness of Christianity, and its ultimate replacement by a superior revelation developing from natural causes, exercised no inconsiderable influence on the views entertained towards the Christian faith about the middle of the thirteenth century.

The third epoch is the age commencing with the Renaissance, and closed by the creation of modern philosophy—1400–1625. Although this period includes the Reformation, whatever of free thought was exhibited in that great movement does not enter into these lectures, treating as they do only of such opposition as was made against Christianity by reason acknowledging no authority beyond its own unassisted light. In these centuries, two chief movements of unbelief are investigated and traced to their respective causes: the one in Tuscany and Rome, engendered by the revival of classical studies and heathen tastes, regarding the Christian faith with indifference; the other of a Pantheistic kind, awakened by the material and rational studies of the great medical school of Padua, and, in the doctrines of Bruno and Vanini, expressing itself in disbelief of the spiritual altogether, and denial of the immortality of the soul. The fourth period, from the seventeenth century to the present day, is of course by far the most interesting, though we need hardly say not to be treated adequately in five "Sermon-lectures." In these Christianity is seen in conflict with modern philosophy and its results, as manifested in (1) English Deism; (2) in French Infidelity; (3) in German Rationalism. One of the best parts, it appears to us, in Mr. Farrar's book, is that in which he treats of the new method of inquiry introduced by Bacon and Descartes in the seventeenth century, and the indirect influence which that method soon began to exercise on theological speculation. Their point of view was emphatically a new one; and the influence of their spirit, however different its direction, was to beget a critical, subjective, analytical study of any topic. Accordingly, when applied to religion, "This is the feature which subsequently characterizes alike the unbelief and the discussion of the evidences. Difficulties and the answers to difficulties are found in an appeal to the functions and capacities of the interpreting mind."—(Lecture IV.) In England this discussion of first principles and appeal to reason, when applied to religious inquiry, produced Deism, allowing the existence of a Deity on the evidence of reason, and creating a religion on the basis of the moral conscience. The several phases of deistic belief in England, from Hobbes to Hume, are sketched with much discrimination, according as the several assaults were directed against the method, the morality, the doctrines, or the evidences of revealed religion. It is in this part of the work that the action of the intellectual causes above mentioned is best seen; the new methods of Descartes, Bacon, and Locke, on the one hand, and the new physical discoveries of Newton on the other, forcibly operating to direct free thought into a sceptical tendency. Our space will not permit us to enter on the infidel form assumed by free thought in the France of the eighteenth century, as the lecturer traces it, from the sneers of Voltaire to the blasphemies of Volney, which he ascribes in a great measure to the spread of the extreme sensationalism of Condillac, Helvetius, and Cabanis, and the diffusion of the deistic literature of England.

But far more remarkable than English Deism or French Infidelity is that form of free thought which in Germany has been denominated "Rationalism." As Mr. Farrar well remarks:—

"The whole movement is distinguished, not only as being the most singular instance in history where the action of free thought can be watched in its intellectual stages, disconnected in a great degree from emotional causes, and where the effort was exercised by the friends of religion, not by foes; but also in the circumstance that though referable to the influence of similar intellectual causes as former epochs of free thought, it is characterized by wholly different forms of them" (Lecture VII.).

Much praise is due to the author for the care with which he has analyzed the several stages of the theological movement in Germany, and its relation to the Wolfian, Kantian, and Hegelian philosophies. We do not know any work wherein so much information is imparted on this subject within so little compass. We must content ourselves with giving Mr. Farrar's summary of it:—

"Commencing in the first period in doctrine with the disbelief of positive religion, replacing dogma by ethics, and in criticism supplying a rationalistic interpretation; in the second, it was improved on the doctrinal side by the separation of religion and ethics, and on the critical by a spiritual acknowledgment of the literary characteristics and psychological peculiarities of revelation; in the third, by a total reconstruction of both inquiries in a more historic and orthodox spirit. . . . The solution of the problem how to reconcile faith and reason was attempted, in the first, by obliterating faith; in the second, by uniting them; in the third, by separating them."

But the lecturer is bent on being exhaustive, and not only carries his investigations of free thought down to the days of Bentham and Coleridge, and their influence on modern religious speculation, but pushes his intrepid analysis into the rationalistic tendencies of Mr. Maurice, Professor Jowett, and the writers in "Essays and Reviews." No one, however, can complain of Mr. Farrar's tone, even when he treads on such delicate ground. Throughout his work he has displayed a fairness of judgment and kindness of spirit which, whether proceeding "from pity for the heart wounded

with doubts" (or what seems to us a more adequate as well as probable cause,) from intelligent acquaintance with the many phases of history and speculation, is seldom met with in Bampton lecturers. In his preface he tells us that he had studied the subject for his private information without any design to write upon it, but simply from the desire of bringing his own views and principles perpetually to the test. This speaks well for the author's candour; but we should have expected that this early disposition to test his own opinions would have generated a more efficient criticism of those of others. As it is, we prefer the historical to the critical side of Mr. Farrar's Lectures: when his criticisms are good, they are rarely his own; when his own, they seldom strike us as profound. On Collins's "Discourse on Free-thinking" we have the safe comment made "that undoubtedly free inquiry is right in all departments, but it must be restrained within the proper limits which the particular subject-matter admits of," &c.; and as the chief effect resulting from the extinction of Christianity in France during the great Revolution, Mr. Farrar adduces "the irreligious mode of spending the Sunday in French society." But we would not wish to dwell upon these and other small blots in a book which, both in the text and the elaborate notes appended to it, bears everywhere marks of conscientious study and impartial judgment, if not of a very penetrating criticism. The Bampton Lectures of 1862 may not fulfil the writer's wish of affording "guidance" or "comfort;" they will not, we are sure, fail of conveying "instruction," where instruction in a manageable compass was particularly needed.

LORD STANHOPE'S MISCELLANIES.*

THIS book possesses at least one merit, not common in these book-making days—it is exceedingly short. We have here altogether not much more than a hundred pages of print, and even this amount of printing is neither small nor close. Any man skilled in the art of judiciously skipping, will be able to "read and mark" all that is really good in this volume in an hour, and to "inwardly digest" the same in half an hour more. After this acknowledgment it may appear ungrateful to say that even as it is the book is too long. Yet this is what candid criticism must pronounce. The first forty pages more especially, which are devoted to Pitt, would have found a more appropriate place elsewhere. They should have been incorporated with the "Life of Pitt" by the noble editor of the "Miscellanies;" and, although thus to bid them "part in peace" would be indeed to consign them to a living tomb, still it is unquestionably a right judgment. Lord Stanhope tells us that the miscellaneous pieces, here collected, were omitted from his life of Pitt as not "material to the narrative." We cannot acquiesce in this reason. On the contrary, it appears to us that such matters as Pitt's difficulties with Ireland, and his correspondence with the Duke of Rutland regarding these difficulties—his dislike to the customs duties and his wish to abolish them—his habits of hard work, and his courtesy towards his subordinates, were all eminently matters fit to be dwelt upon in a book which professed to be at once a record of the statesman and a biography of the man. Nay more, we think that if they had been embodied in such a work, they would have been at once more interesting and more instructive than when thus thrown upon the world as unconnected fragments. We cannot, indeed, assert that they would have made Lord Stanhope's "Life of Pitt" interesting or instructive. That would have been an achievement beyond hope. But they might have improved it; and they would there have occupied their right place, whereas here they are by no means in their right place. If Lord Stanhope was determined to revert to his conspicuous failure to commemorate the great commoner worthily, he might have done better than give to the world theavings of his notebook. He might have supplied many omissions, and corrected many blunders. It would have been something had he even corrected the errors, of which the Auckland Correspondence convicted him as to Mr. Pitt's love affair with Lady Eleanor Eden.

After we have done with Mr. Pitt the interest of the book begins. It is not an interest which criticism can, with much profit, illustrate or enlarge upon; in fact, the collection is hardly susceptible of criticism at all, or at least only of that style of criticism which consists in giving specimen extracts. To read it is like listening to the conversation of a man who has lived in the best society: we hear of distinguished men, and we hear of them in their familiar life; but *what* we hear will be valued by some readers and despised by others. No principles of criticism whatever can be applied to such a collection. Every one will think of it as seems good in his own eyes; and the critic cannot feel that he has any claim to regulate that judgment. He can but indicate to the reader the nature of the entertainment prepared for him. The men who show out best—the heroes of the book, if we may so call them—are beyond question Lord Macaulay and Sir Robert Peel. Perhaps the most interesting thing in the whole collection is a memorandum by the greatest Conservative premier on the character of the greatest Whig premier. Lord Mahon sent the original "character" of Sir Robert Walpole, which he had prepared for his history, to Sir Robert Peel, for his approval. Sir Robert did not approve at all, thinking Lord Mahon's judgment far too severe, and gives with great force and clearness his reasons for his opinion. There is a certain sedate humour in the way in which Sir Robert shows up the absurdity of Lord Mahon's contrast

* Miscellanies. Collected and edited by Earl Stanhope. London: John Murray, Albemarle-street. 1863.

between Walpole and Strafford, which is exceedingly amusing. Here and there, too, passages occur, betraying, we think, very surely that the warmth of the defence of Walpole was in some measure attributable to personal feeling.

"But in estimating the characters and conduct of men living at different periods, in apportioning to each their respective merit or blame, justice cannot be done unless due allowance be made for the difference of circumstances imposing different duties, and calling into action different qualities.

"You must have a new test by which to try the conduct of public men, varying with the lapse of time, with the altered character of events, and with the changes of public opinion.

"In my opinion men, and the conduct of men, are much more the creatures of circumstances than they generally appear in history. Infamous as Robespierre and Marat unquestionably are, it would be no easy matter to assign to each their due share of infamy without a very dispassionate inquiry into many minute events which contributed to shape their course, and into the degrees of conflicting dangers between which they had to choose."

The following sarcastic remarks on the outcry against Walpole's corruption are perfectly sound, and show a love of truth and a contempt of humbug which tend materially to elevate our conception of Sir R. Peel's character:—

"When one recollects what other Ministers, the predecessors of Walpole, had so recently done; the shameful bribes which had been taken by Cabinet Ministers—by Sunderland, and Aislabie, and Craggs—for the furtherance of the South Sea scheme; and when one reads the report of that committee, the bitter enemies of Walpole, their horror at his attempts on the virtue of the Mayor of Weymouth, their indignation that in order to secure a favourable returning officer he had promised the mayor a place in the revenue; that he had committed the shocking atrocity of dismissing some excise officers who voted against the Government candidate, one cannot help smiling at the virtuous rage of these incensed patriots, who seem, like the giants in Rabelais, after having swallowed windmills for their daily fare, to have been choked by a pound of butter."

By a somewhat similar device, Lord Mahon elicited from the Duke of Wellington a memorandum containing a comparison between Napoleon and Marlborough, and between Marlborough and himself; but this, as might have been expected, is rather jejune. The object was to prevent Lord Mahon from inserting in his history some casual expressions which the duke had used in conversation, and which no one but the most literal of men would have thought of so inserting, and to this object it was strictly confined.

All the world has heard stories without number of the vast learning and wonderful memory of Lord Macaulay; we have here a few more added to the stock. Mr. Stirling wishes to discover the origin of an apocryphal story told by Robertson, to the effect that Charles V., at Yuste, finding that he could make no two of his clocks go alike, remarked that perhaps he had erred in attempting to compel uniformity in the more difficult matter of religion, and accordingly, "would like to ask Mr. Macaulay, who knows where everything is to be found." Lord Mahon does ask Mr. Macaulay, and gets an answer, if not beyond doubt the correct one, certainly the most plausible which has yet been given. Again, Lord Mahon and the Duke of Wellington have a difference as to when the English army first wore red, and the point is referred to the omniscient Secretary for War in 1851, who determines it by a quotation from Hudibras. A more difficult question, namely, whether human sacrifices were in use among the Romans, is referred to the same authority, and also to Sir Robert Peel. The latter, being an ex-Minister, goes into the matter very fully, and quotes passages tending to show that they were; the former, being then in office contents himself with arguing from the references furnished to him, and comes to the conclusion that they were not. The following quotation from a letter to Lord Mahon will give readers some idea of the labour with which Lord Macaulay's learning was acquired and kept up:—

"I am certainly much better, and I begin to hope that six weeks more of the Downs will completely restore me. I have been reading a great deal of execrably bad Latin—Suetonius, Vulcatius, Spartianus, Trebellius Pollio, Julius Capitolinus, Lampridius, Vopiscus—and I am going to try to take the taste of all the barbarisms which I have been devouring out of my mouth with the 'Andria' and the 'Heautontimorumenos.' I have read Herodian too. His Greek is not first-rate, but is immeasurably superior to the Latin of his contemporaries. After all, there is a great deal to be learned from these writers. Hume was quite in the right when he said that Gibbon ought to have made more of the materials for the 'History of the Empire' from the Antonines to Diocletian. Indeed, Gibbon very candidly admitted the justice of Hume's criticism."

Dignity unbending is always a pleasing spectacle, and dignity has seldom unbent more gracefully than in the following lines:—

"Valentine to the Hon. Mary C. Stanhope (Daughter of Lord and Lady Mahon). 1851.

"Hail, day of Music, day of Love,
On earth below, in air above.
In air the turtle fondly moans,
The linnets pipes in joyous tones;
On earth the postman toils along,
Bent double by huge bales of song,
Where, rich with many a gorgeous dye,
Blazes all Cupid's heraldry—

Myrtles and roses, doves and sparrows,
Love-knots and altars, lamps and arrows.
What nymph without wild hopes and fears
The double rap this morning hears?
Unnumbered lasses, young and fair,
From Bethnal-green to Belgrave-square,
With cheeks high flushed, and hearts loud beating,
Await the tender annual greeting.
The loveliest lass of all is mine—
Good morrow to my Valentine!

Good morrow, gentle Child! and then
Again good morrow, and again,
Good morrow following still good morrow,
Without one cloud of strife or sorrow.
And when the god to whom we pay
In jest our homages to-day
Shall come to claim, no more in jest,
His rightful empire o'er thy breast,
Benignant may his aspect be,
His yoke the truest liberty:
And if a tear his power confess,
Be it a tear of happiness.
It shall be so. The Muse displays
The future to her votary's gaze;
Prophetic rage my bosom swells—
I taste the cake—I hear the bells!
From Conduit-street the close array
Of chariots barricades the way
To where I see, with outstretched hand,
Majestic, thy great kinsman stand,*
And half unbend his brow of pride,
As welcoming so fair a bride.
Gay favours, thick as flakes of snow,
Brighten St. George's portico:
Within I see the chancel's pale,
The orange flowers, the Brussels veil,
The page on which those fingers white,
Still trembling from the awful rite,
For the last time shall faintly trace
The name of Stanhope's noble race.
I see kind faces round thee pressing,
I hear kind voices whisper blessing;
And with those voices mingles mine—
All good attend my Valentine!

"T. B. MACAULAY."

"St. Valentine's Day, 1851."

On the whole it is impossible to deny that Lord Stanhope is a disappointing writer. He reminds us, not to say it offensively, of Mr. Pecksniff's horse—always giving promise of great performance yet invariably leaving that promise unfulfilled. His books are never so good as they should be. "Much worse than we seem," should be their motto. He is always meritorious and always tiresome. His materials have always been the very best; his workmanship has always been inferior. He has written the history of a most interesting time, he has written the life of one of our greatest statesmen, and the record and the memoir alike are insufficient and unsatisfactory. This "Collection" is of the same stamp. Few men, with Lord Stanhope's opportunities, would not have made a better thing of such an undertaking. However, if we cannot heartily praise, most certainly we will not blame. It would have been worth while encountering a far more ponderous tome than this to be rewarded by Sir Robert Peel's memorandum and Lord Macaulay's valentine.

AURORA FLOYD.†

For some months past the attention of the young-lady section of the novel-reading community has been almost entirely devoted to the consideration of bigamy under various aspects. It may be that the responsibility of making the topic fashionable rests with Mrs. Theresa Longworth Yelverton; but we doubt whether she had not more justification than those authoresses who, for the purpose of producing sensations in the minds of romantic and unsophisticated girls, construct plots which, skilfully contrived and brilliantly narrated, possess a piquancy denied to the reports of the proceedings in the Divorce Court. It may be, indeed, that this same court has much to answer for in the matter; and that a class of novelists are rising up amongst us who will make it their duty to illustrate, in a style at once artistic and thrilling, those varied legal details which are often too concise in their terms, and too undisguised in their expression, to be agreeable to the general reader. We can hardly take up a *Times* without perceiving the skeleton of a sensation novel only waiting to be appropriated by Mrs. Wood or Miss Braddon, and put on the stage tricked out with the necessary amount of tawdry morality and high-flown sentiment. We have always understood that "Jack Sheppard" and the "Newgate Calendar," which professed to be the record and illustration of crime, and not the inculcation of it, were, nevertheless, the favourite reading of those who warred upon society; and that, so far from the pictures which these books exhibited of the sad results of a misspent life warning others by the examples they contained, they possessed a strange fascination for criminals of all classes, and in many instances actually tempted their readers into

* The statue of Mr. Pitt in Hanover-square.

† Aurora Floyd. By M. A. Braddon. In three volumes. Tinsley Brothers.

the vicious life they portrayed. One of the chief duties of the novelist is, doubtless, to present pictures of society at once truthful and interesting, but we cannot sympathise with those who select for illustration scenes of domestic misery and crime. We all know that incidents such as those it is now the fashion to popularize, do happen, but fortunately they rarely come before the public, and it is time enough for young women to become familiar with their details should they be unfortunately involved in them themselves. We would not for a moment accuse the two most popular authoresses of the day of wilfully endeavouring to corrupt society; we give them every credit for the attempt to point the moral, by involving the misguided heroes and heroines in every description of misery—though they usually end happily—but we utterly dispute the efficiency of the means to the end; we deny that the picture presented to us in "East Lynne" of a divorced woman living as governess with her former husband and his wife is a profitable subject for society to contemplate. We fail to see the advantage which the reader is to derive, while following with breathless interest the intrigues of a Lady Audley, whose whole energies and talents are devoted to concealing from one husband her marriage with another, whose every breath is a lie, and who does not shrink from murdering the man she swore to love. Lastly, in the novel before us, the inconvenience attending the clandestine marriage of a young lady with her groom is very clearly set forth; but we do not think this is a fact which young ladies generally would be inclined to dispute, and we do not see what point is gained by making the heroine marry a rich Yorkshireman while she is still the groom's wife, and, the groom being subsequently opportunely shot, live happy ever after. Still, whatever may be said against the moral, there can be no doubt that "Aurora Floyd" is infinitely the best of the bigamy novels. It is as far in advance of "Lady Audley's Secret" as "Lady Audley's Secret" is of "East Lynne." Not only is the plot more skilfully contrived and better sustained towards the end, but the style is more finished. There are touches of humour and pathos which we look for in vain in Miss Braddon's former work, and often an elevation of thought which would have accorded better with a loftier subject.

The character of John Mellish, the honest Yorkshire squire, is drawn with a skill that is all the more remarkable when we remember that the artist is a woman. Aurora Floyd herself is a specimen of the sex whose personal appearance we might admire, but, in spite of our authoress's evident desire to enlist our sympathies in her favour, she fails to attract them. A masculine woman with a heart is not a loveable being; but a masculine woman without a heart borders on the repulsive, even though her eyes are unexceptionable. Aurora Floyd is of this type. She hates the groom she runs away with,—the only common bond of sympathy between them having been horses and dogs. She is then engaged to be married to Talbot Bulstrode, and although she is mortified at his final rejection, in consequence of her own act, she soon gets over it. Two years afterwards "Aurora might have been shipwrecked and cast on a desert island with Talbot Bulstrode, and might have lived ten years in his company, without ever feeling for ten seconds what she had felt for him once." She had, in the meantime, married John Mellish, the Yorkshire squire, but, says our author, "I do not know that she ever felt any romantic or enthusiastic love for this big Yorkshireman;" in fact, she was obliged to put up with him, and consoled herself by bullying him. "He was not a creature to despise, for his very weaknesses were manly. Perhaps Aurora felt this, and that it was something to rule over such a man." To judge by the glimpses afforded us of the fiery nature of this young lady, the hand of steel was not always concealed by the velvet glove. This is her method of "ruling" a groom—not the one she ran away with and married.

"Aurora sprang upon him like a beautiful tigress, and, catching the collar of his fustian jacket in her slight hands, rooted him to the spot upon which he stood. The grasp of those slender hands, convulsed by passion, was not to be easily shaken off; and Steve Hargraves, taken completely off his guard, stared aghast at his assailant. Taller than the stable-man by a foot and a half, she towered above him, her cheeks white with rage, her eyes flashing fury, her hat fallen off, and her back hair tumbling about her shoulders, sublime in her passion.

"The man crouched beneath the grasp of the imperious creature.

"Let me go," he gasped in his inward whisper, which had a hissing sound in his agitation, "Let me go, or you will be sorry; let me go."

"How dared you?" cried Aurora, "How dared you hurt him? My poor dog? My poor, lame, feeble dog? How dared you to do it? You cowardly dastard; you—"

"She disengaged her right hand from his collar, and rained a shower of blows upon his clumsy shoulders with her slender whip—a mere toy, with emeralds set in its golden head—but stinging like a rod of flexible steel in that little hand."

It was this "little hand" that the big Yorkshireman adored, so there is nothing more to be said on the matter—it was one of his "manly weaknesses." For our own part, if a woman is to marry two husbands at the same time, we would rather she were a muscular heroine of this stamp, with whom we have no sympathy, than the wicked but fascinating Lady Audley. In neither case is the picture a pleasant one to look on; and Miss Braddon showed no little courage and knowledge of her public when she ventured on her second illustration of this favourite crime.

If we have failed to convey a very favourable impression of her last effort, it is not because we deny Miss Braddon's talent as a writer, but because we regret to see it employed on so unlovely a theme; and because, moreover, we foresee that the effect of fami-

liarizing the public mind with highly wrought scenes of misdirected passion, will in all probability lead to the extension of sensation plots into a region of social experiences at present almost entirely appropriated by French authors. It is not long since we had occasion to notice a novel in which the interest was centred in a love affair between a step-daughter and her step-father, during the lifetime of the mother, and we regret the indications these works afford of a growing tendency in this direction. The influence of a pernicious literature, however well disguised, cannot fail to have an insidious effect upon the class of minds chiefly devoted to sensation reading; and it is in no spirit of ill-nature that we have alluded thus strongly to the unfortunate bent which Miss Braddon's imagination seems to have taken, but rather in the hope that she may be induced to employ her pen to charm, rather than to shock society. The task will be more difficult, and therefore more worthy her talent.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER.*

MR. SHUTTE has got out his book after all; here at least is one volume of it. He might have spared himself that rebuff with which the Bishop met his application for "your lordship's assistance towards supplying myself with reliable matter." Indeed, he now tells us that all he had ever wanted of the Bishop was—1st, his lordship's consent to the printing of some extracts from letters of the Bishop's which were in Mr. Shutte's possession; 2nd, to learn from his lordship's own lips the right interpretation of some "doubtful and difficult points." For, as might have been expected, on examining the Bishop's published writings, he had "occasionally found that statements and facts were capable of more than one interpretation." Now, let us suppose that the Bishop had agreed to confer with Mr. Shutte on those matters. If such an interview had taken place, we know that one of the two would have been a very clever man; but which of them would have been the more candid is "a doubtful and difficult point." Yet an extraordinary degree both of candour and cleverness must be presumed in him who can be trusted by himself to supply his biographer with "the right interpretation" of the facts of his own life. Wisely, therefore, as it seems to us, the Bishop declined to have anything to do with it; remaining deaf to Mr. Shutte's plea, that the terms offered him by Messrs. Saunders & Otley "were so liberal," that he could not refuse to undertake the task. But a more serious question for Mr. Shutte is, whether, in telling the Bishop that "if I cannot have your lordship's free assistance, I have no alternative but to fulfil my engagement with the publishers in the best way I can," he meant to threaten his right reverend diocesan with the publication of the letters in spite of him. Mr. Shutte indignantly denies that he ever meant to do or to threaten any such thing. The Bishop, however, by instantly applying to the Court of Chancery for an injunction, took care that, at any rate, it should not be done. As to this point, again, as we observed at the time, we think his lordship was in the right.

It is now our turn to see how Mr. Shutte, lacking whatever help he sought of the Bishop, has made up his book. He assures us, of course, that he needed no such help, and preferred writing quite independently of the Bishop; he repeatedly told Messrs. Saunders & Otley that he was sure that the Bishop's co-operation would never be obtained. But, in his second letter to the Bishop, last July, he complained of "not receiving from your lordship the assistance which can alone make the book valuable." With this discouraging intimation, we began its perusal, having the author's word for it that its contents were of no value; and, after reading through the whole volume, we find his admission confirmed. Mr. Shutte tells us really nothing about the Bishop of Exeter that we did not know before. From the Clergy List, the printed pamphlets of Dr. Phillpotts, a few volumes of Hansard, and one or two old files of local newspapers, almost the whole of this information might have been gathered with very brief research. These materials, indeed, would have been sufficient for a writer with any historical faculty, and tolerably acquainted with the general state of things, political and ecclesiastical, in England during the first thirty years of this century, to have composed, in much less space, a far more complete account of Dr. Phillpotts' public life, up to the second year of his episcopate, at which point this volume leaves him. Mr. Shutte, however, as a mere compiler, is a most unskilful one; his grasp on the substance of his narrative is so feeble, that he is fain to drop it, every now and then, and totters into long extracts lugged in with a few commonplace phrases of commendation, so filling half a dozen pages at once with a huge cutting from some one of the published tracts or speeches, which, though more readable than any passage which he himself has written, is utterly destructive of the continuity of his work. This habit makes it a painful exercise to get at a distinct view of a group or series of events; and the biographical interest is entirely lost sight of. Mr. Shutte has a trick of shifting the incidents of a person's life to and fro, postponing the earlier, or anticipating the later events, for the sake of bundling them together with all of the same kind which he picks up on his way. This is not the proper method of biography. The development of individual character and agency and position, should be the leading and connecting idea from first to last.

It will not do, for instance, in relating the career of Dr. Phillpotts, while describing the rapid preferment which he gained by

* The Life, Times, and Writings of the Right Rev. Dr. Henry Phillpotts, Lord Bishop of Exeter. By the Rev. Reginald N. Shutte, B.A., Rector of St. Mary Steps, Exeter. Vol. I. Saunders, Otley, & Co.

Bishop Barrington's favour, to defer considering the services he rendered to that prelate, in his controversy with Dr. Lingard, until we come to his controversy with Mr. Charles Butler, twenty years later. Mr. Shutte knows, as well as we do, that a step on the golden ladder of Church dignities and emoluments was the price which Dr. Phillpotts received for every pamphlet he wrote against the Catholics or against the Whigs. Mr. Shutte does not affect to deny, that "this may help to account for the controversial tone of the whole of Mr. Phillpotts' writings up to the time of his elevation to the Episcopal Bench." We have said no more than this of the earlier portion of his career, as an able and ambitious partisan who had resolved, like Jonathan Swift, to win his way in the world by the dexterous use of his pen. In a short memoir of him, which appeared in this journal six months ago, he was treated simply as a type of the clerical politician of the last age, when it was by denouncing the opponents of a Tory Ministry, and especially the promoters of Catholic Emancipation, that a polemical champion might earn the patronage of the ruling powers.

A writer unknown to us, who has felt moved, after some delay, to publish * his "strictures" upon our unpretending sketch of the Bishop's public life, admits what he calls the "imputation," that the Mr. Phillpotts of fifty years ago, in his literary efforts to procure himself Church preferment, "studied and served the times." In the opinion of this apologist, "as much or as little may be said of any man, whether of High Church, Low Church, or no Church, Whig, Radical, or Tory opinions, whose abilities advance him in the world." Mr. Shutte, likewise, while professing to admire the present Bishop as, "of all the illustrious prelates who have ruled the diocese of Exeter," one who has done the most to merit the homage of the Church, admits that he rose to the cathedral throne by such means as we have suggested:—

"But fifty years ago the case was different. Clergymen then mingled freely in all the contests of a stirring age. It was not thought beneath the gravity of their calling to assume the part of whippers-in at elections, or of political lampooners. A pamphlet had often led the way to a stall. Rich livings had been won by still more questionable means; hence it was that men fitted to shine in the world of letters, or ambitious to earn a minister's regard, were dragged, however reluctantly, into the whirlpool of political controversy. The fault was not entirely their own. They might, indeed, have followed the obscurer life of pastoral usefulness; but once having quitted it, they were impelled by the necessities of an imperious age. And this may help to account for the controversial tone of Mr. Phillpotts' writings."

We are quite satisfied with Mr. Shutte's explanation, since, with regard to the actual circumstances of Mr. Phillpotts' early achievements and early success, his statement agrees with our own. It was not as a ground of personal reproach, but as an example of the different spirit which in that age prevailed among the dispensers of Church patronage and the candidates for Church promotion, compared with those of our own day, that we deemed fit, in an historical point of view, to notice those facts of his early career. To all sincere friends of the religious institutions of this country, it is a matter of congratulation that rich benefices, canonries, deaneries, and mitres, are no longer bestowed upon the most vehement champions of a dominant political party. All the Crown appointments in the Church for the last fifteen or twenty years have recognized other qualifications for her sacred offices—learning, piety, or "pastoral usefulness" being the most essential. We will not hint a doubt that, if the same considerations had influenced in this respect the governments of which Lords Sidmouth, Eldon, and Liverpool formed part, Dr. Phillpotts might have risen, by the exhibition of more distinctly evangelical gifts, to be, as he is, an ornament of the Episcopal Bench.

His biographer, indeed, gives us very slight opportunities of judging in what degree his capacities for "pastoral usefulness" were really proved. The two livings which he held jointly, at the outset of his clerical life, being situated, the one near Bath, and the other at Stainton, near Durham, "it is believed" that he never resided at either. His next benefice, held along with the chaplaincy to the Bishop of Durham, was that of Middleham, where "no traces of his incumbency remain, beyond some anecdotes which prove him to be an active and not always a popular magistrate." As for the rectory of Gateshead, a populous parish, in which a zealous clergyman, with an income of £1,250, might have laboured with conspicuous results, his biographer says, "There are no details of interest during the short incumbency of Mr. Phillpotts; the only circumstance to be recorded is, that his second son was born in this parish." His presentation, soon afterwards, to the parish of St. Margaret, caused "some ill-feeling." He is remembered, however, in that parish for his "great administrative ability," as well as for "the tact and address with which he controlled turbulent spirits at the vestry meetings." Meantime he received, from the unfailing partiality of his diocesan, first one, and then another still more lucrative cathedral stall.

All this time, be it observed, he was writing pamphlets against the Catholics; the time came for writing pamphlets against the Whigs. The rectory of Stanhope, valued at from £5,000 to £7,000 a year, was given to him in the year after his attack upon Mr. Lambton, on the occasion of the meeting to protest against the Peterloo massacre. "But whether," as Mr. Shutte observes, "it was at all necessary for Mr. Phillpotts to appeal to the public on such a matter as this, is a question which will be answered according as people think on the subject of political pamphlets

being made a stepping-stone to ecclesiastical preferment." The amiable biographer is pleased, however, to inform us not only that Dr. Phillpotts, while at Stanhope, built himself a parsonage house, or rather a parsonage palace, which cost him £12,000, but also that, if we know how to accept the remark made by an old woman to his successor, he "sent two of her sons to heaven." With this apostolical residence and vocation, the writing of his pamphlets against Earl Grey and Jeffrey, on Queen Caroline's affair, brought him the offer of an Irish bishopric, which he refused. We do not learn that in those years when Dr. Phillpotts displayed all the keenness of his wit and the agility of his logic in disputing the pleas of Mr. Canning for religious liberty, his cure of souls was so much better discharged than his neighbours', as, in return for the very large amount of his various emoluments, the Church and the country might have required. The merits which gained him, in 1828, the Deanery of Chester, and the Bishopric of Exeter in 1830, were confessedly of a different kind.

The gift of a deanery was, in Mr. Shutte's opinion, "a substantial recognition of his labours in resisting the claims of the Roman Catholics;" but Mr. Shutte is not of opinion that the bishopric was given him as a reward for his vote in support of Mr. Peel, at the Oxford University election, when Mr. Peel had espoused those claims. We shall not, however, be tempted here to re-examine that transaction, since the documents with which Mr. Shutte has furnished himself are precisely those to which former writers had referred. It was admitted by us that, as the bishop himself has shown, in his "Letter to Sir Robert Inglis," he had always avowed that he would consent to admit the Catholics within the pale of the Constitution, if every individual Catholic would declare that it was not necessary for salvation to hold the Catholic faith. The proposal of such terms was tantamount to a perpetual denial of Catholic emancipation. The upshot of it all was, that Mr. Peel and the Duke having at last made up their minds to an unconditional act of emancipation, Dr. Phillpotts made up his mind to support Mr. Peel. But we now leave him in the see of Exeter, to which Mr. Shutte conducts him at the end of this volume; and we should prefer a more skilful guide than Mr. Shutte is likely to prove, in the volumes which may follow, to lead us through the Parliamentary squabbles, the incessant litigations, the diocesan scandals, and the conflicts of ecclesiastical authority, which have marked the uneasy rule of Bishop Phillpotts for the last thirty years.

A FEMALE RAGGED SCHOOL IN EGYPT.*

MISS WHATELY had visited Egypt once before, as an ordinary tourist; but she went there again, and lived for a twelvemonth in her own hired house at Cairo, for the purpose of establishing a day-school, in which plain needlework and the reading of the Bible might be taught to the poor little girls of that city. The result of her labours and observations is put before us, in a very unaffected and pleasing manner, in this little book. Since "The Englishwoman in Egypt," we have not had such a glimpse into the domestic life of the native population there. Miss Whately really lived quite among them, and sought by neighbourly kindness to persuade them to trust her with their children. Her chief assistance was from a Syrian Christian family who occupied the lower storey of her house. The mother, Um Usuf, or "Mother of Joseph," entering very readily into Miss Whately's plan, went round with her into the lanes and alleys of the quarter to canvass for scholars, while the eldest daughter, Menni, was teacher and Arabic reader; Miss Whately, who knew only a few words of the language to begin with, superintending the school. Before the twelvemonth was out, she was able to talk pretty freely, both to the children who were gathered in, and to their parents whom she visited at home. A Syrian lady, Mrs. R—, who seems to have been an educated person, the wife of a European settled at Cairo, sometimes accompanied Miss Whately in going amongst the people. With all this, it may still be imagined that the difficulties of opening confidential intercourse with the motley folk of Egyptians, Moslem and Copt, the Bedouin Arabs, Syrians, Turks, and others, who came in her way, must have been extremely formidable; and the cleverness with which she got through this courageous enterprise, though she herself may not think much of it, will rather surprise the home-staying reader. But we know that a good will can go a good way; Miss Whately found the power to talk, when called upon to explain her proceedings, in the presence of thirteen or fourteen Moslem grown-up persons, because she had something which she earnestly desired to say to them.

With rare prudence, however, she refrained on all occasions from directly assailing the Mohammedan faith, and rather strove to assure her Moslem hearers that our Book, since they hold it as an axiom that a true Religion must be founded on a Book, contains the full histories of Joseph, Moses, David, and Jesus, who are venerated as prophets by every true disciple of Mecca. When asked if she wanted to make Christians of them, she replied, with a touch of evangelical diplomacy, that she was not able to do so; that to make Christians was beyond any human power, but that she would show them the truth, and leave God's word to operate on their minds,—since it was one great point in her favour, that the Mahomedans are taught to regard both the Old and New Testament with reverence, as preliminary to the Koran. Miss Whately's harmless stratagems to make the people acquainted with the New Testament may provoke a smile, but would have

* The Bishop of Exeter and the London Review. A Reply to Strictures on his Lordship which appeared in the London Review of August 30, 1862. W. Thompson.

* Ragged Life in Egypt. By M. L. Whately. Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday.

been an inexcusable deception if its reading had been forbidden to them. It is pleasant to see how she bribed the professional storyteller to recite, in a public coffee-house, the parables of Christ instead of the popular tale of "Abou Hassan's Slippers," while the missionary ladies, from their own windows on the opposite side of the narrow street, listened for the well-known words of St. Matthew's Gospel, to make sure that he had faithfully performed his bargain. A scene of deep interest is that of one evening on board a Nile boat, where the simple boatmen, waiting in idleness, after they got tired of their rude songs and dances, were entertained by the strange lady with the reading of "stories," being those of the lost sheep, the lost piece of silver, and the prodigal son. They heard all this, followed by the Ten Commandments and the fourth chapter of St. John, with earnest attention; after which, one old white-bearded man, "who seemed to have the spirit of a little child, lowly and ready to learn," looked up at her, with a touchingly wistful expression, and said, "What shall I do? I cannot read, and you will soon go; I hear no more of this; how am I to know what God would have me do?" None of us can refuse to join in Miss Whately's hope that, from these few attempts of hers to scatter amongst an ignorant race the seeds of a purer morality and of a more spiritual faith than that of the Koran, some good fruits, though unobserved, may grow.

One serious obstacle to her special work of instructing the native girls was the notion of Mahomedans that the souls of women are essentially inferior, and unworthy of cultivation. To this prejudice, one of the most pernicious features of Eastern superstition, the vices of their social life are in a great measure due. Polygamy, indeed, is seldom practised by the lower classes; but the denial of female education, attended by the monstrous custom of disposing of mere children in marriage, has most degrading and distressing effects. We are told, for instance, of a little creature eleven years old, "neither in looks nor manners at all older than girls of that age among city children of the poor in England," being espoused to a lad of fifteen for a bridal gift of fourpence, which she spent in buying sweetmeats, and got a beating from her mother for so doing; in the very week before this she had stayed away from school in a huff, because another girl had torn off the arms of her doll! This shocking haste of parents to get rid of their daughters by premature matrimony is owing, perhaps, in many cases, to their scanty house accommodation; for poor Salhah, the child-wife just mentioned, is seen, in one of the woodcuts from Miss Whately's drawings which illustrate her book, actually seated upon the roof of a small hovel about the size of an English pigstye, in which her mother crouches, with no room to spare, while the father smokes his pipe outside, and the little ones crawl in the mire. One young matron, whose frank and confiding disposition soon gained Miss Whately's heart, was Shoh, *i.e.*, "Ardently Beloved," not fifteen years of age, and still the victim of a maternal as well as of conjugal tyranny which moved the author's compassion. On her first visit to the school, leading in her little sister, she stood listening and smiling, but thought herself, perhaps, too much of a woman to join the A B C class; she came, however, again and again, with a dirty baby and a lot of oranges; till one day, fired with a sudden resolution, she put the baby on the floor, presented the oranges to the teacher, and, seating herself on the mat at Miss Whately's feet, seized an alphabet-card, and began to pronounce the letters, that she might learn to read with the busy little maids around her. Poor Shoh! whenever she could get away from household drudgery, her husband being absent with his donkey on errands of trade, she would come to the foreign lady's house, "and bounce in with an air of joyous triumph," kiss Miss Whately's hands, then run to wash her own, pulling off her headkerchief to show that her plaited hair was neat, and, settling down in a corner, repeat the lessons in which she delighted. Overhearing a conversation, in which Miss Whately assured the suspicious women that her only motive for opening this school was her love for the children whom she would try to benefit, poor Shoh anxiously whispered to Menni, pointing at Miss Whately, "Does she love me?" It was impossible to resist all this, and we do not wonder that the eager, affectionate girl became a special favourite. "Ya habeeby, oh yes, my dear, certainly I do love you, Shoh, and all of you. I want you to go to Heaven with me!" replied the good English lady; at which declaration we can fancy how those wild Egyptian girls, having never heard the like of it in their lives before, opened their great black eyes, and stared at the friendly speaker, as though an angel had visited them from some brighter and happier sphere.

These touches of true humanity, which abound in Miss Whately's narrative, give to her little book an interest even for those who may not reckon on much positive outward success of missionary schools in Egypt. "She kissed my child!" exclaimed a fond mother, on returning from her first interview with the stranger who had come, for such incredible objects of Christian philanthropy, to dwell amidst the neglected poor in a Moslem quarter of Cairo; it seemed wonderful to those lowly people that anybody, most of all that a Frank and a *Sitt* or "lady" should care for them. "I believe you love God, for you love the children," said the Turkish milliner, *Sitt* Haanem, or Mrs. Haanem, as we might call her, as she sat, smoking and directing her work-girls, when Miss Whately called upon her. This logic could scarcely be disputed in the case of one who was approaching, in the name of Christ, the hearts of an alien and jealous population, with the gentle entreaty, "Suffer your little children to come, and forbid them not." Indeed, the mothers sometimes feared that Miss Whately might be too

fond of their children, and carry them off to England. She exclaimed indignantly, at this charge of being a kidnapper, "Listen, Oh woman! we have girls plenty in our country,—more girls than we want" (which, as Miss Rye and Miss Faithfull tell us, is but too true),—"why should we take yours?" This disclaimer was borne out by Shoh, testifying that she had seen pictures of Miss Whately's own *bint och* or sister's daughters, who were much nicer, prettier, and cleaner, than her young country-folk, and therefore Miss Whately was not likely to want to carry these away. An elder sister of Shoh's, likewise a married woman, named Fatmeh, her own three children having died within a fortnight, burst into passionate tears when she saw the portraits of Miss Whately's fair little nephews and nieces hang upon the wall. What less could the kind Englishwoman do than try to soothe her sorrow with the only words of universal comfort, "Dear Fatmeh, God is good?" It is for incidents such as these, full of that natural feeling which makes the whole world kin, that we are charmed with Miss Whately's humane and womanly book.

We should like to know what has become of poor Shoh, the "Ardently Beloved." She has, perhaps, since Miss Whately's departure, had rather a hard time of it, with a cruel mother and aunt, who disliked her attending the school, and who once set upon her in the street, beating her most unmercifully, tearing her hair, and dragging her along the ground, and bidding one of the boys to bite her savagely in the arm. It may well be believed that Miss Whately had some pain in leaving these poor people, when the twelvemonth was over, after the many affecting conversations she had had with them, and the children's holiday feast in the tamarisk grove, and "the mothers' meeting," at which she bade them farewell. Her hope and promise is, that this work of charity, which she began in faith and conducted with exemplary prudence, shall not be discontinued. We know little, as yet, of the "Society for Promoting Female Education in the East;" but if its counsels and operations are always guided by such a spirit as that which pervades this volume, we should be pleased to hear of its success. Difficulties, however, still greater than any of those to which she has alluded, will probably arise in any attempt to uproot Mahomedanism, and to plant Christianity in its stead, on the banks of the Nile. Meantime, we are glad that a countrywoman of ours, having commenced this generous experiment, gives us, in such an interesting narrative, a genuine picture of the lower strata of social life in Egypt.

SHORT NOTICES.

It was in 1848 that Mr. Mitchell* crossed the Atlantic; and though Richmond, in which town he had some friends, was his immediate destination, he could not possibly have then foreseen that observations on its social life would ever possess for us any such interest as they may now derive from the mighty strife of which Richmond is the centre. If we pass over his personal adventures on landing in the James River, which, though humorously told, were scarcely worth the telling, we come to a scene that really invites our attention,—the plain and comfortable household of a Virginia planter, in that very district which, for the last year or two, has been ravaged by the civil war. Mr. Mitchell's description of the manners of this class, or rather of the families by whom he was entertained, is not only that of an agreeable, but of a respectable sort of people; and we cannot, apart from our abstract disapproval of slavery, regard them with wholesale detestation, or even refuse them, on non-political grounds, a certain share of our sympathy in the terrible ordeal they have lately gone through, involving so much private suffering. The country gentleman, for example, whose hospitality Mr. Mitchell first accepted on his arrival in America, was neither a harsh master nor a licentious and covetous trafficker in human flesh; simplicity, peace and good order, with homely plenty abiding in the house, hallowed by family affection as well as by domestic piety, reminded the visitor, in his first evening there, of Burns' "Cottar's Saturday Night," but that there was nothing rustic in the manners of its inmates. The townsfolk of Richmond, with whom Mr. Mitchell had a more prolonged intercourse, seem, upon the whole, to have made rather a favourable impression upon him, though he was startled, as most Englishmen would be, upon entering a saleroom, to see half a dozen of his fellow-creatures "knocked down" by the slave auctioneer. In some respects he found that Richmond middle-class society, under the influence of what are called "church members" or "professors," was characterized by a tone of mild prudery which tempered the honest mirth of the elders, and kept the innocent freedoms of the young people within bounds. This we see displayed in his amusing sketch of a "frolic," or festive party, where the treat consisted of plum-cake, lemonade, and ices, with some rather "slow" and guarded talk, varied by timid singing, until they warmed up to a tolerated substitute for dancing, which is called "jogging along." But one fair, plump, good-humoured girl was called to order even for this. "Miss Ellen, I shall report you, and have you turned out of the church, for if that ain't dancing, I'll be blamed!" There is a vein of pleasantry in this part of Mr. Mitchell's book; and he enjoyed the mellow summer evenings at Richmond, when youths and maidens strolled about in the quiet streets of the little town, under the watchful eyes of their parents seated at the open windows or in the house porches; while the banjo music and laughter of the careless negroes, mixed with the voices of social converse, or notes of the pianoforte from

* Ten Years in the United States. By D. W. Mitchell, formerly resident in Richmond, Virginia. Smith, Elder, & Co.

drawing-rooms above, were sounds of peace, the recollection of which, now that Richmond has become associated with the fiercest of modern wars, appears to him worthy of note. These Virginian experiences of his, though involving no extraordinary incidents, are the best part of his book; for his acquaintance with the other States of the Union seems to have been extremely limited, and his political reflections, which are decidedly hostile to the Northern Abolitionist party, will command but little attention. He would have done better to have presented his reminiscences of social life in Virginia, without those trite and tedious discussions, in a volume of half this size, or in the pages of a magazine.

Mr. Hugo Reid, whose outline of the "History of the United States" may naturally be taken next in our way, is described as "late Principal of the Dalhousie College" at Halifax. His book, which is compactly arranged, concisely written, and correct, so far as we have had leisure to test its statements, is calculated to be useful to those who would examine, aided by a brief synopsis like this, the historical antecedents of the great revolution now going on. To such inquirers, we may add, Bacon's "Guide to American Politics" will, at the same time, be no less serviceable, as it supplies the text of all important documents relating to the political constitution of the Union, from its establishment to the present time, with a strict analysis of its purport, showing respectively the limitations of the Federal power, on the one hand, and of the State Legislatures on the other, as well as its provisions for the temporary government of the territories immediately subject to Congress, and for their final incorporation as new States. The second part contains all the Secession ordinances lately passed by the Southern States, with the new Constitution adopted by the Southern Confederacy, and a statistical appendix, in which the wealth and population of all the thirty-four States are set forth. We can safely recommend this little handbook, as well as that of Mr. Hugo Reid, to all who would form an impartial and accurate opinion of the present dispute. American politics lead us, unhappily, to the subject of Lancashire distress, on which Miss Ellen Barlee, whose treatise on the destitute classes in London we noticed last week, has published the result of her inquiries in a visit to three or four of the cotton-manufacturing towns in December last. She first stayed with the Rev. Mr. Jeaffreson, rector of a large district in Stockport, where, in his night-schools and sewing-classes, and in her daily calls at the homes of the suffering people, she learnt much of their usual habits, and of their present needs. In Manchester, she inspected one or two of the chief institutions which have been created provisionally for the assistance and comfort of the unemployed; but most of her information about these is borrowed from the locally-published reports. She then went to stay with Mr. Hopwood Hutchinson, the ex-Mayor of Blackburn; and in that town had sufficient opportunities of learning what efforts are made there by the Relief Committee, the different religious congregations, the Strangers' Friend Society, and other charitable agencies dealing with the temporary distress. Miss Barlee testifies that the mill-owners themselves are "doing a great deal, in a practical and unostentatious manner;" and their liberality is acknowledged by the operatives, who, amidst the privations which they must endure, "make little or no complaint." We regret, however, that she has too readily adopted the besetting prejudice of most unofficial and irresponsible inspectors of the poor, against the mode in which the legal ratepayers' funds are administered by the Poor-law guardians. Her strictures upon those necessary rules which, though involving sometimes a hardship to individuals, protect the distribution of public money from vast abuses, and protect the poor from the demoralising influence of a reckless system, appear too hastily conceived. The remarks which she makes upon the social aspects of the manufacturing operatives' life, in general, and upon the employment of married women in the cotton-mills, which prevents their properly attending to their domestic duties and "child-ward care," are worthy of attention, though not quite original, or bearing very directly on the existing distress.

The author of "Beauties of Tropical Scenery" has not only read Humboldt, but he has been in the West Indies. He has also read "Childe Harold," but has not become a Byron. A poet's mission is not to apostrophise a group of islands, individually and collectively, in laboured stanzas of eight or nine lines apiece, with triply-rhymed terminations, in fine rhetorical phrases of flattery. There is a lack of human interest in this performance. It may, indeed, serve as an incentive to the study of natural history or geography; but literature is not much indebted to it, except as another proof of the unconscious imitation of mere style—the author's favourite models being confessed by the turn of his language and versification in every page. Besides the descriptive passages of "Childe Harold," he seems occasionally to have caught the manner of Darwin's "Botanical Garden." Thus, invoking that new-fancied mythological personage whom Arthur Clough has styled "the Goddess of Bathing," the author, after having enjoyed his swim, vociferates, while drying himself on a rock—

"Divine Ablution! antidote to heat!
Pure pristine pleasure, unalloyed with bane,
Arm'd in thy panoply, secure I meet
The noonday sun," &c.

All which, in a sanitary point of view, is correct.

MUSIC.

THE performance of Mendelssohn's "Elijah" by the Sacred Harmonic Society on Friday week was, in most respects, one of high excellence. This oratorio has, by frequent repetition, become almost as familiar to our choristers and instrumentalists as Handel's "Messiah," "Israel in Egypt," and "Judas Maccabæus," which works, indeed, it bids fair to rival in popularity if not even in permanence. The difficulties, both vocal and instrumental, which "Elijah" at first presented, have now been smoothed down so as to leave no impediments to its thorough and effective realization, even by the vast concourse of voices and instruments over which Mr. Costa presides at the concerts of the Sacred Harmonic Society. It is questionable whether a finer performance of "Elijah," as regards the chorus and orchestra, was ever heard, than that to which we now allude. Much of the splendour of the general effect was undoubtedly owing to the admirable and efficient band, comprising most of our best solo-players, and so strong in numbers as to form an adequate balance to the great mass of vocal sound. Hence all the fine traits of the instrumental score—those delicate details and minute touches of colouring which so admirably contrast and relieve the choral effects,—had their due prominence and significance, and served to complete a grand musical picture, every portion of which has its importance. In such a work as "Elijah," abounding as it does in all the rich elaboration of modern orchestral effects which have an interest apart from the vocal portion of the score, any inadequate proportion of the band to the chorus is much more seriously felt than in the works of the older masters, where the instruments frequently play the same passages as those sung by the chorus, any special feature in the orchestra being there rather the exception than the rule. Thus, in "Elijah," among other choruses, "Blessed are the men," "Thanks be to God," and "He watching over Israel," lose much of their effect and charm if the independent features of the orchestral score are weakened by the disproportionate smallness of the band. This is a point that cannot be too strongly enforced, since the general effect of all musical performances must depend on that nicely adjusted balance of sound which answers to the harmony of colours in a picture. Mr. Costa is well aware of this, and his name as conductor is always a guarantee of orchestral completeness and excellence. At the performance of "Elijah," to which we now refer, the principal singers were Madame Rudersdorff, Madame Saindon Dolby, Miss Lascelles, Mr. Henry Haigh, and Mr. Weiss. Madame Rudersdorff sang with an energy and intention which proved her to be a cultivated and intelligent artist; and if her vocalization be not always irreproachable, there is yet a meaning and significance in her reading which place her far above a mere mechanical executant. Mr. Henry Haigh, who was the tenor, has an agreeable and sonorous voice, but is wanting in that breadth of style and power of rhythmical phrasing which are specially requisite in music of such fervid expression. He sings as if more accustomed to the sentimental ballad or the *suave* Italian opera than to that grand and elevated style which the music of the great German masters (and especially their sacred music) so imperatively requires. Even the unquestionably rich quality of his voice will avail little in this department of the art unless allied to greater command of declamatory expression. There is scarcely any other English basso who can give such dignity and force to the music of the prophet as Mr. Weiss, whose delivery of the declamatory song, "Is not His word like a fire?" was as forcible as his singing of the air, "It is enough, O Lord" was expressive. The pathos which Madame Saindon Dolby imparts to the air "O rest in the Lord" generally procures an *encore*, and the present occasion was no exception. The subordinate parts were allotted to Mrs. F. Lucas, Mr. Patey, Mr. John Morgan, and Mr. Smythson.

Mr. Balfé's new romantic opera, "The Armourer of Nantes," was produced on Thursday, at the Royal English Opera. We reserve a detailed criticism of the work for our next publication.

CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE.

THE Royal Society of Literature, on Wednesday evening, presented a scene of the most animated kind. The report on the Mayer papyri and the Simonides' "Uranus," adopted by the Council, was read.

The report began by referring to the exhibition of Mr. Mayer's papyri in January last, at the society's rooms, for the examination of such gentlemen as wished to inspect them. Amongst those who availed themselves of this opportunity were Sir Frederic Madden, Sir Charles Nicholson, Mr. Birch, Mr. Bonomi, Mr. Eliot Hodgkin, the Rev. Dr. Cureton, Dr. Hunt, Sir H. C. Rawlinson, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Poole, Rev. Mr. Hugo, Dr. Guest, and Mr. Goodwin. Dr. Simonides, accompanied by Dr. Dracachis, was present during the whole time, and Mr. Vaux, and other members of the council, on the part of the society. No formal decision was come to by those gentlemen who inspected the documents, but nearly the whole of them, the report stated, were adverse to the admission of the genuineness of the papyri. It was remarked, *inter alia*, that there was a great similarity in the handwriting of the different MSS., more than could be the result of accident; that

* A Handbook of the History of the United States. By Hugo Reid, late of Halifax, Nova Scotia. Griffith & Farran.

† Bacon's Guide to American Politics; or, a Complete View of the Fundamental Principles of the National and State Governments, with the respective powers of each. Sampson, Low, Son, & Co.

‡ A Visit to Lancashire in December, 1862. By Ellen Barlee, Author of "Friendless and Helpless," and "Our Homeless Poor." Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday.

§ Illustrations of the Beauties of Tropical Scenery. By the Author of "The Nuptials of Barcelona." R. Hardwicke.

letters characteristic of very different periods were frequently found in the same MS.; that occasionally forms of Greek letters occurred, the existence of which in other ancient documents those most accustomed to palæographic studies did not recognize; that, in some instances, the presumed ancient letters in the papyri bore a strangely suspicious resemblance to modern Greek characters; that the descriptions of the contents of the papyri recently placed on them seem to be in one and the same hand with the inscriptions on the papyri themselves; that the colour of the papyri was generally different from that usually noticed in MSS. of the same nature, and was possibly derived from artificial staining; and lastly, that in some instances portions of papyri of different textures had been joined together, so as to make up one piece. The report further stated that the papyri exhibited, with one exception, had been so fastened down that it was impossible to see what was on the other side of the written portion, and that, therefore, no opinion could be formed of the state of the papyrus when first unrolled. Nothing new had been elicited in proving the identity of the MSS. exhibited with those taken from Mr. Mayer's museum to be deciphered by Dr. Simonides, and the statement of which was published two years ago by him. Gentlemen who had seen the collections of the Rev. Mr. Stobart, and of Mr. Sams before they were purchased by Mr. Mayer had said that they had no remembrance of such fragments as those exhibited; and the report went on to point out that in the papyri the writing was sometimes bent down so as to fit existing cracks or holes, and that in fragment No. 7 the writing was written round a hole previously made. Attention was also called to the unusual length of the lines of writing, which would induce suspicion on the part of those best versed in palæographic studies.

Besides the papyri, Dr. Simonides had also exhibited two rolls of Hieratic writing, of the genuineness of which there was no doubt whatever; as also the famous volume of "Uranus," about which there has been so much discussion amongst the scholars of Germany. No definite objection was taken to this MS., as the nature of the writing could only be determined by microscopic examination, the means for which were not provided at its late exhibition. A particular phrase, *καὶ ἰμὴν ἰδιαν*, originally occurring in it, and objected to by the German men as wholly unlike ancient Greek, had been erased, and another Greek phrase, *ὡς ἰμοὶ δοκῇ*, substituted in its place.

Such was the substance of the Report. After the reading of it, the Chairman proposed that a paper by Mr. W. Wright, "On the Codex Sinaiticus," should be read before the discussion. But some friends of Dr. Simonides objected to this course as notice had not been given of the second paper, they had come prepared to discuss only the first, and that that discussion would be restricted in time and in its results by the introduction of other matters. The meeting deeming it right to give "fair play" to Dr. Simonides as a foreigner, decided to take the discussion on the report forthwith, which was then opened by Mr. Hodgkin, who said that he had examined the manuscripts with very great care and, as far as the natural senses could be depended on, he could find nothing in their actual state which should impugn their genuineness. He had been asked by Mr. Vaux if Mr. Mayer could trace the identity of these manuscripts, and since then he had seen the curator of Mr. Mayer's museum, who saw and assisted at the unrolling of the manuscripts, which, he added, it was important to state had not been removed from Mr. Mayer's museum until after the meeting of Mr. Mayer's friends there on 1st May, 1860, when the passages which were now subjected to dispute had already been brought under public attention. He stated further that the curator could identify by their form and appearance the portion of St. Matthew, and the letter of Hermippus, the "Periplus" of Hanno, and the "Dynasties of Carthage," as belonging to the series unrolled by Dr. Simonides and himself in the Mayer Museum, although he could not read the writing. The large letter the curator remembered distinctly as belonging to Mr. Stobart's collection. As to Mr. Goodwin's assertion about the adherence of some minute portions of blotting-paper, it would have been important if the fragmentary matter had been under the writing; but as that was not the case, the imputation of Mr. Goodwin had evidently no value whatever. While the manuscripts were under exhibition, in the Society's rooms, he had asked for a microscope, but no instrument having been furnished there, they had since been submitted to such an examination by the very eminent microscopist, Mr. Deane. Mr. Thomas Wright confirmed Mr. Hodgkin's statement of the publication of the papyri before Mr. Mayer's soirée, which took place before the papyri had left Mr. Mayer's possession. Mr. Yates said he had examined the "Hanno" and the "Uranus" most minutely, and could detect no flaw that could militate against the genuineness of the writing. He also had seen Mr. Mayer's curator; and he explained to the meeting in detail the manner and method of unrolling the papyri in Mr. Mayer's museum. Dr. Simonides unrolled, and the curator pasted down the pieces on calico. The curator had recognized the identity of the Gospel of St. John. The great importance of the assumed readings of these manuscripts was such that no doubt it was right closely to scrutinize them; but other important inscriptions had been found in unlikely places besides these. For himself he could say that he had called on Dr. Simonides at his residence, and no man in his conduct could be to all appearance more sincere or more honest. It had been urged against Simonides that he only brought inferior documents for sale in this country, but it was that gentleman's intention, naturally enough, to present his finest manuscripts to the University of Athens. Mr. Deane, whose examination had been somewhat chemical as well as microscopical, pointed out an important fact in respect to the appearance of one writing over another. When the manuscripts were submitted to him, casting his eye over some "crossed" letters lying on his table, he perceived that at the junction of the two writings there was a tendency of the fluid used in the upper one to run out into the line of the lower writing; and by experiments he found that this took place, through the chemical affinity of the writing-fluid irrespective of whether the paper was dry or damp. This fact had a strong bearing on the question of the genuineness of the "Uranus," for his examination showed at least that the whole of the under, or uncial, writing must have been written before

the dark, or ecclesiastical, writing was written over it; and which inference was confirmed by the fact that the fine cracks in the superior or dark writing had not been filled up with any writing fluid, as would have been the case if the pale writing had been carried over them.

He had used a binocular microscope, and he was satisfied also by this means that the pale writing ran under the dark writing; and lastly, this could be proved by mechanical means—such as scraping off the upper or dark writing with a penknife. If, therefore, the "Uranus" was a forgery, the uncial writing was forged first and before the ecclesiastical writing was put over it. His assistant had also examined this work, and had come to the same conclusions. He had also gone over the Hieratic papyrus. At one end a portion had been washed away by accident. He was informed this was admitted to be genuine. He wished, therefore, to see what appearance this part exhibited. He had also washed and examined some fragments of papyri given him by Mr. Hodgkin, but he could detect nothing in the Mayer papyri that had the appearance of fraud. In the part of the Epistle of St. John it had been said there was a number of minute white spots which had been supposed to be fungi. He had looked at them with a lens, and, if they were fungi, they were above the letters. They may be chemical compounds or chalky matter; and inorganic materials will travel it was well-known a long way in damp substances. These specks must, however, tend towards the genuineness of the document, at least as far as Simonides is concerned, because if he had put any writing on the papyri he must have obliterated the spots. It was then urged by Sir F. Madden as inimical to Dr. Simonides' claim for the validity of his documents that there were letters of unusual form in them, for instance, the lines of the Greek η were carried above the line far higher than usual in other documents. A sloping η was very rarely met in old documents; and it was singular that the same kind of letter should be used in Dr. Simonides' publications. Mr. Birch, of the British Museum, thought the question of validity should not depend on the belief of a curator, but should be decided by the internal evidence of the documents themselves. There were two ways in which the genuineness could be proved or disproved—palæographically and philologically.

It was impossible, in his opinion, these manuscripts could be genuine. He then referred to the Greek passage which was alluded to in the report, and jocosely asked if, like a chameleon who could change its skin, a parchment could change its writing. Moreover, the coincidence with Bunsen's statements were, to his mind, too close to allow him to accept these disputed manuscripts.

Dr. Dracachis said it was not likely that any man in his senses would have done what Dr. Simonides had been supposed to have done in giving such valuable documents as mere substitutions to Mr. Meyer. If they had been his, and he could not have sold them himself, he could have disposed of them to advantage through another person. In respect to Mr. Goodwin's assertions, that he could wash out in a few minutes the writing from the papyri, he (Dr. Dracachis) had tried for forty-eight hours, and then failed to effect that object—some particles of the writing-fluid would remain in the tissue of the papyrus. Mr. Deane confirmed this statement, that traces of the colouring matter would remain in the tissue after the most careful washing. Mr. Hamilton, of the British Museum, said he had washed out some writing from papyrus. Dr. Dracachis challenged him to produce the sample, and he would show him the traces remaining. The Chairman pressed for time, and said the philological questions were the most important. Dr. Dracachis said Mr. Goodwin had looked over Lepsius, and some other authors, and had found some words coinciding with some words in the inscription in the Hermippus of Mr. Mayer. If any person were to take down an ancient work and find the words "father" and "daily bread"—words expressive of things in every day life, in every age, he might with as much reason, or more, contend that these words were proof of the existence of the Lord's Prayer. He then read Mr. Goodwin's attempted translation of one passage, and followed by reading Dr. Simonides' translation, showing, he remarked, a sensible translation in the latter, and a nonsensical one in the former case. As to the asserted substitution of a passage in the "Uranus," that passage was correct in the MS. "Uranus," but the misreading was an error in Tischendorf's printed work, which it was known was full of orthographical and other errors. Mr. Goodwin said it was impossible for him to make himself understood to gentlemen who knew nothing about Egyptology or palæography. The phrases in Egyptian rituals were often very obscure, and most persons when they read a translation would not know what it meant. All he could say was, that on the Champollion principles the translation he had given was correct; and he asserted that the so-called inscription was nothing more than three or four lines from a ritual. In reply to interrogatories from Dr. Dracachis, Mr. Goodwin believed the writing might be washed out.

Mr. W. Wright's paper was then read. It consisted of a notice of Tischendorf's discovery of the MS. Codex Sinaiticus; and some personal imputations upon Dr. Simonides, of having written the letters in the *Guardian* and *Literary Churchman*, and purporting to be from the Greek priest, Kallinikos.

A Greek present, M. Nicolaidis, attacked Dr. Simonides, and said that at the time Dr. Simonides had stated he was at Mount Athos, he was not there; and that if he had been he was too young to have been admitted into the monastery. Dr. Simonides, however, confronted him with a short decisive statement of the cause of the personal animosity towards himself which had caused the utterance of these mis-statements. And as, in reply to cross-questions from Dr. Dracachis, this gentleman—understood to be an excommunicated priest—contradicted himself on a material point of dates as to his own residence at Mount Athos, it is not worth while to encumber our space with what at most can be only regarded as a personal squabble. In reply to a question from the chairman, Mr. Curzon said that he had been in the library of the monastery of Mount Sinai, but because he did see the disputed MS. there at that time it by no means followed it was not or had not been there. Sir F. Madden made some further remarks, and a gentleman made a calculation of how much manuscript Simonides must have

written per day to have made the Codex Sinaiticus, as Simonides asserts he did. Dr. Simonides was present and spoke but little. His addresses were in Greek, short, concise, and to the point. As the chairman remarked, in concluding the meeting, which lasted until near 12 o'clock, the subject seemed interminable, and would doubtless be carried to other arenas before the public heard the end of it. It is certainly to be hoped, considering the importance of the questions at issue, which are not merely antiquarian, but historical and theological, involving in the latter phase the very authenticity of certain readings of the New Scriptures—that the absolute truth or absolute falsity of the disputed documents should be incontrovertably established.

At a recent meeting of the Royal Society, Dr. Angus Smith gave an interesting account of researches made by him on the "Absorption of Gases by Charcoal." This paper, the first of a series, was confined to oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbonic acid. The remarkable fact that oxygen is absorbed by charcoal, whilst the nitrogen of the air is not touched, seems to have been hitherto overlooked, although it was well known to be more readily absorbed than nitrogen; or, to use the words of the "Handwoerterbuch der Chemie," by Liebig and Poggendorff, "Tarrot, Grindel, Nogel, and Saussure have shown that oxygen was absorbed from air more readily than nitrogen, and that with certain proportions of charcoal no oxygen was left." Dr. Angus Smith showed that for a time there was no nitrogen absorbed, but that only oxygen was removed by the charcoal; also that a similar separation takes place when oxygen and hydrogen are exposed to charcoal. This, however, can only occur within certain limits; if charcoal saturated with oxygen be exposed to nitrogen, the oxygen is itself removed to make way for some nitrogen. Although this result must, in some measure, depend on the compressibility of gases, it is without doubt a form by which electric action is produced in porous bodies. This may be taken in connection with the theoretical portion of the paper, in which the author gives his reasons for believing that there is no distinction to be drawn between the attraction called physical, which results in cohesion, and that attraction which has for an ultimate result chemical combination, and which is ascribed to chemical affinity. Bodies show an inclination to combine, and are attracted towards each other, but the final result—combination—is not always possible, although it is only when possible that the action can be called purely chemical. The author, wishing to avoid the multiplication of natural powers, or names to natural force, reasoned to prove that the one is only the incompleated action of the other, or that both the chemical and so-called physical are one. When a piece of charcoal containing nitrogen is put into a tube of oxygen gas over mercury, the nitrogen first comes out of the charcoal so as to depress the mercury considerably, and then the oxygen becomes absorbed. If there be little nitrogen, and the absorbing power of the oxygen be great, this effect is not seen. This phenomenon may be remarked more frequently with other gases which are less rapidly absorbed than oxygen.

The oxygen cannot be removed by warming or by boiling water. The charcoal is then found to give out carbonic acid instead. The combination of oxygen with probably the finer parts of the carbon has occurred at a temperature even below the temperature of boiling water. The author has not decided how much below.

Animal-charcoal has this combining power much more active than wood-charcoal, probably on account of this very fineness.

Wood-charcoal absorbs oxygen for a month when put into the pure gas, carbonic acid only for a short time, and hydrogen still shorter. The author thinks that the oxygen ceases to be absorbed on account of the presence of carbonic acid formed. He views nearly the whole surface of the earth as a porous body, therefore continually absorbing and evolving gases where exposed to change.

LIST OF MEETINGS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES FOR NEXT WEEK.

MONDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY.

ASIATIC—5, New Burlington-street, at 3 P.M. "On a newly-found Bactrian Pali inscription." By Professor Dowson.

MEDICAL—32A, George-street, Hanover-square, at 8½ P.M. "On the Differences between the Diseases of the Nervous, Circulating, and other Systems of the Child and Adult." By Mr. Thomas Bryant.

TUESDAY, 17TH FEBRUARY.

ETHNOLOGICAL—4, St. Martin's-place, Trafalgar-square, at 8 P.M. 1. "On the History of the Gipsies." By J. Crawford, Esq., President. 2. "A Brief Account of the Yenadies of the Chingleput District." By Dr. Shortt.

CIVIL ENGINEERS—25, Great George-street, Westminster, at 8 P.M. Discussion on "Drainage of Dundee," and "Sewerage of Newport."

PATHOLOGICAL—53, Berners-street, Oxford-street, at 8 P.M.

ROYAL INSTITUTION—Albemarle-street, at 3 P.M. "On Animal Mechanics." By Professor Marshall.

STATISTICAL—12, St. James's-square, at 8 P.M.

WEDNESDAY, 18TH FEBRUARY.

GEOLOGICAL—Burlington House, at 8 P.M. 1. "On the Middle and Upper Lias of Dorsetshire Coast." By C. E. K. Day, Esq. 2. "On the Correlation of the several Divisions of the Inferior Oolite of the Middle and South of England." By Dr. Harvey B. Hole.

LONDON INSTITUTION—Finsbury-circus, at 7 P.M. "Vertebrata." By C. Carter Blake, Esq.

SOCIETY OF ARTS—John-street, Adelphi, at 8 P.M. "On the Best Means for Promoting the Growth and Improving the Quality of Cotton in India." By A. Nesbitt Shaw, Esq.

THURSDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY.

ROYAL SOCIETY—Burlington House, at 8½ P.M. 1. "The Effect of Temperature on the Secretion of Urea." By Dr. E. Becher. 2. "On Clinant Geometry, as a Means of Expressing the General

Relations of Points on a Plane, Realizing Imaginaries, and Extending the Theories of Anharmonic Ratios." By A. J. Ellis. 3. "On Skew Surfaces, otherwise Scrolls." By A. Cayley, F.R.S.

ANTIQUARIES—Somerset House, at 8½ P.M.

LINNEAN—Burlington House, at 8 P.M. 1. "On the Geographical Distribution of the Aculeate Hymenoptera collected by Dr. Wallace in the Eastern Archipelago." By F. Smith, Esq. 2. "On the Anatomy of *Filaria Medinensis*, or Guinea Worm." By Mr. Bastian.

CHEMICAL—Burlington House, at 8 P.M.

NUMISMATIC—13, Gate-street, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

ROYAL INSTITUTION—Albemarle-street, at 3 P.M. "On Chemical Affinity." By Dr. Frankland.

FRIDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY.

ROYAL INSTITUTION—Albemarle-street, at 8 P.M. "On Recent Discoveries at Jerusalem." By Rev. Geo. Williams, B.D.

PHILOLOGICAL—Somerset House, at 8½ P.M. "A Scientific Analysis, Classification, and Representation of the Sounds in English Words attempted." By Rev. D. Coleridge.

GEOLOGICAL—Somerset House, at 1 P.M. (Anniversary.)

LONDON INSTITUTION—Finsbury-circus, at 7 P.M. "Non-Metallic Elements." By Professor Field.

SATURDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY.

ROYAL INSTITUTION—Albemarle-street, at 3 P.M. "On the Science of Language." By Professor Max Müller.

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS FOR THE WEEK.

Ada Fortescue. By the author of "The Dalrymples." Three vols. Post 8vo., cloth, £1. 11s. 6d.

Alcock's (Sir Rutherford) The Capital of the Tycoon: Three Years' Residence in Japan. Two vols. 8vo., cloth, £2. 2s.

Bellamy's (J. C.) The Housekeeper's Guide to the Fish-market. 18mo., cloth, 1s.

Bennett, Rev. Dr. James, A few Memorials of. 8vo., cloth limp, 1s.

Better Times Coming; or, More in Prophecy. Fcap., cloth, 2s.

Books for the Household. Nine vols. Fcap., cloth, 1s. each.

Chitty's (J.) Treatise on the Law of Contracts. Seventh edition.

By J. A. Russell. Royal 8vo., cloth, 32s.

Collins's (Wilkie) No Name. New edition. Three vols. Post 8vo., cloth, £1. 11s. 6d.

Destiny (The) of the Human Race. By the author of "The Study of the Bible." Two vols. Crown 8vo., 12s.

Dickson's (N.) The Books of Lindsay & Son, Merchants: Book-keeping by Single Entry. Fcap., cloth, 2s. 6d.

Epigrams: Ancient and Modern. With Preface, by the Rev. John Booth. Fcap., cloth, 6s.

Eyebright: A Tale from Fairy-Land. By the Hon. Augusta Bethell. Second Edition. 16mo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

Fisher's (Jas.) The Assembly's Shorter Catechism Explained. Twenty-third edition. 18mo., cloth, 2s.

Freeman's (E. A.) History of the Federal Government. Vol. I. 8vo., cloth, 21s.

Hoare's (Dean) English Roots and the Derivation of Words. Third edition. Fcap., cloth, 4s. 6d.

Hopps's (John Page) Discourses of Daily Duty and Daily Care. Second edition. Crown 8vo., cloth, 2s.

Illustrations of the Beauty of Tropical Scenery. By the Author of "The Nuptials of Barcelona." Crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

Jervis's (Capt. White) The Ionian Islands during the Present Century. Crown 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

Kinglake's (A. W.) History of the Invasion of the Crimea. Second edition. Two vols. 8vo., cloth, 32s.

Laing's (Samuel) England's Mission in the East. 8vo., sewed, 1s.

Latham's (R. G.) The Nationalities of Europe. Two vols. 8vo., cloth, 32s.

Lyell's (Sir Charles) The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man. 8vo., cloth, 14s.

Lyra Anglicana: Hymns and Sacred Songs. Collected by the Rev. R. H. Baynes. New edition. Fcap., cloth, 3s. 6d.

Magnet Stories (The) for Summer Days and Winter Nights. Vol. V. Fcap., cloth, 2s. 6d.

People (The) of Europe. Second series. Twelve coloured pictures. 18mo., sewed, 1s. 6d.

Pirn's (Capt. Bedford, R.N.) The Gate of the Pacific. Illustrated. 8vo., cloth, 18s.

Rask's (Prof.) Short Tractate on the Longevity ascribed to the Patriarchs. Crown 8vo., boards, 2s. 6d.

St. Olave's. Three vols. Post 8vo., cloth, £1. 11s. 6d.

Sears' (Edmund H.) Regeneration. Fcap., cloth, 3s.

Senior's (Nassau W.) Biographical Sketches. Crown 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

Smart's (John) The New Theology. Edited by his Wife. Crown 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

Smith's (Dr. Wm.) Principia Latina. Part III. Latin Poetry. Fcap., cloth, 3s. 6d.

Smith's (J. Denham) Winnowed Grain: Selections from Addresses. Second edition. Fcap., cloth, 3s. 6d.

Sutton's (F.) Systematic Handbook of Volumetric Analysis. Post 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

Therry's (Justice) Thirty Years' Residence in New South Wales and Victoria. 8vo., cloth, 14s.

Waddell's (Rev. H. M.) Twenty-nine Years in the West Indies and Central Africa. Crown 8vo., 10s.

Westropp's Eighteen Selected Vocal Duets, with Pianoforte Accompaniments. 4to., sewed, 1s.

Yearsley's (Dr. James) Deafness practically Illustrated. Sixth edition. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

THE LONDON REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, SOCIETY, LITERATURE, ART, & SCIENCE.

Published every Saturday. 32 pages. Price Fourpence.

CONTENTS OF No. 136, FEBRUARY 7, 1863:—

The Opening of Parliament.
New Phase of the Cotton Scarcity.
The Military Situation in America.
British Trade in China.
The Brazilian Difficulty.
New Banking Companies.
The Marquis of Lansdowne.
Colenso on Kinglake.
A Horse-Stealer in Search of the Beautiful.
Fire and Fashion.
The Throne of Greece.
The Comic Press in Prussia.
The Trial of Effie Deans.
The Past Week.

REVIEWS:—

Daniel Manin.
Les Matinées Royales.
Mr. Story's "Rome."
Bellew's "Afghanistan."
French Literature.
Short Notices.

ART AND SCIENCE:—

Music.
Contemporary Science.
The Royal Institution.
The Anthropological Association.
List of Meetings.
List of New Books.

OFFICE: 11, SOUTHAMPTON-STREET, LONDON, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

ROYAL ENGLISH OPERA, COVENT GARDEN. Under the Management of Miss LOUISA PYNE and Mr. W. HARRISON, Sole Lessees.

On Monday, Feb. 16th, Tuesday, 17th, Thursday, 19th, and Saturday, 21st, will be presented (third, fourth, fifth, and sixth times) Balfe's Grand Romantic Opera, in three acts, entitled—

THE ARMOURER OF NANTES.

The Baron de Villefranche. { Envoy of Louis XII. of France. } Mr. W. H. Weiss.
Fabio Fabiano, Count de Beauvoir—Mr. Santley.
The Count de Moulac. { Nobles of Brittany. } Mr. Goodwin.
The Count de St. Breux. { Mr. James.
M. de Ploerchartel. { Mr. Price.
M. de Kerkouën. { Mr. C. Lyall.
A Jew—Mr. H. Corri. Pascal (a gaoler)—Mr. A. Cook.
Raoul, the Armourer—Mr. W. Harrison.
Anne, Duchess of Brittany—Miss Anna Hiles.
Dame Bertha—Mrs. Aynsley Cook.
Marie (an orphan)—Miss Louisa Pyne.
The Music by M. W. Balfe. Libretto by J. V. Bridgeman.
Conductor—Mr. A. Mellon.

On Wednesday, Feb. 18th (being Ash-Wednesday), there will be no performance. After which, on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, the Burlesque opening of the Grand Pantomime, entitled BEAUTY AND THE BEAST; or, the Gnome Queen and the Good Fairy. Concluding with the Grand Transformation Scene, Moonbeam and Sunlight; or, the Descent of Morn's First Ray.

Doors open at Half-past Six. Commence at Seven. Private Boxes, from 10s. 6d. to £4. 4s.; Orchestra Stalls, 10s.; Dress Circles, 5s.; Upper Boxes, 4s.; Amphitheatre Stalls, 3s.; Pit, 2s. 6d.; Amphitheatre, 1s. Box-office open daily from Ten till Five. No Charge for Booking or Fees to Box-keepers.

CHRISTY'S MINSTRELS, (Last Week but two) every Night at Eight, and Wednesday and Saturday Afternoons at Three o'clock, in ST. JAMES'S HALL. The Programme will include the popular Songs, "Come where my Love lies Dreaming," "Willie we have Miss'd You," "Annie Lisle," &c., first introduced into this country by this Company. Thursday, Feb. 19th, Mr. Wambold's Benefit.

ART-EXHIBITION for the Relief of the LANCASHIRE DISTRESS, 6, Suffolk-street. Open from 10 a.m. until dusk. Admission, 1s. Catalogue, 6d.

F. W. DICEY, } Hon. Secs.
A. L. CHETWODE, }

MR. and Mrs. GERMAN REED, with Mr. JOHN PARRY, will appear EVERY EVENING (except Saturday) at Eight, and Saturday Morning at Three o'clock, in THE FAMILY LEGEND; after which Mr. John Parry will introduce a new Domestic Scene, entitled MRS. ROSELEAF'S LITTLE PARTY.—ROYAL GALLERY OF ILLUSTRATION, 14, Regent-street.

GEOLOGICAL EXCURSION.—PROFESSOR TENNANT will accompany his Class from King's College, on Wednesday, February 19th, to AYLESFORD, to examine the CHALK, GAULT, and GREENSAND of the District. Any old Student or Member of the GEOLOGISTS' ASSOCIATION desirous of joining the party, Professor Tennant will be glad to see. He hopes to have the assistance of the Rev. T. Wiltshire, B. Waterhouse Hawkins, and Mr. Bensted.—The Train leaves London Bridge at 10.15 a.m.

ROYAL SCHOOL OF MINES, Jermyn Street.—The following Courses of LECTURES are about to be commenced:—

Thirty Lectures on PHYSICS. By Professor TYNDALL, F.R.S. To be delivered on every week-day but Tuesday, at 10 A.M., commencing on 16th February. Fee for the Course, £3.

Thirty-six Lectures on APPLIED MECHANICS. By Professor WILLIS, M.A., F.R.S. To be delivered on every week-day but Saturday, at 12, commencing 16th February. Fee for the Course, £3.

Thirty Lectures on GEOLOGY. By Professor RAMSAY, F.R.S. To be delivered on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays, at half-past one, commencing 16th February. Fee for the Course, £3.

TRENHAM REEKS, Registrar.

PUBLISHERS AND THE BOOK TRADE

TO LET in PATERNOSTER-ROW, newly built PREMISES. Enquire of JOHN KNIGHT & SONS, Soap Works, Old Gravel-lane, St. Georges' East.

HYDE ABBEY SCHOOL, Winchester.—Head Master, the Rev. EDWARD FIRMSTONE, M.A. (Oxon), assisted by resident graduates from the Universities of Cambridge, London, and Paris. Sons of gentlemen are prepared for the public schools and the universities, also for Sandhurst, Woolwich, and the naval, military, and civil services.—Terms, references, and list of pupils who have recently passed examinations from this school will be forwarded on application to the Head Master.

BEN RHYDDING, ILKLEY, YORKSHIRE

A WINTER AND SPRING RESIDENCE.
PHYSICIAN.—Dr. MACLEOD, F.R.C.P.E., F.A.S. Scot.
SURGEON.—THOMAS SCOTT, M.D., Edin., M.R.C.S.E.

Ben Rhydding is one of the most complete and most comfortable establishments in England for the reception of patients and visitors. While the method of treatment pursued at Ben Rhydding proceeds on Hydrotherapeutics as to its main principle, it is by no means confined to that, but includes the systematic application of the Art of Cure in its whole range, and with all its resources.

NORTH BRITISH AND MERCANTILE INSURANCE COMPANY.—Established 1809.

JOHN WHITE CATER, Esq., Chairman } Of the
CHARLES MORRISON, Esq., Deputy Chairman } London Board.
The Directors have opened a Branch Office at
8, WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL MALL.

NORTH BRITISH AND MERCANTILE INSURANCE COMPANY.—Established 1809.

Incorporated by Royal Charter, and Special Acts of Parliament.
Paid up Capital, £250,000.

INVESTED FUND equal to nearly TWO MILLIONS.

JOHN WHITE CATER, Esq., Chairman } Of the
CHARLES MORRISON, Esq., Deputy Chairman } London Board.
The Company carries on Business both in Fire and Life. Annuities and Reversions Granted and Purchased. Foreign Risks undertaken.
In the Life Department, the number of Policies issued during the last four years were in—

| | 1858 | 1859 | 1860 | 1861 | Sums Insured. |
|--|--------------|------|------|------|---------------|
| | 405 Policies | 605 | 741 | 785 | £377,425 |
| | | | | | 449,913 |
| | | | | | 475,649 |
| | | | | | 527,628 |

The Books for 1862 not yet made up.

The leading features of the Office are—

1. Entire security to Insurers—both from the Subscribed Capital and Invested Funds.
2. In the Life Department large Bonus additions. The Company allowing nine-tenths of the Profit on the Life Business to Policy Holders on the participating Class.
3. Varied Tables of Premium to meet all cases.
4. Liberality and promptness in settlement.

Head Offices:

LONDON: 58, THREADNEEDLE-STREET, and 4, NEW BANK BUILDINGS.
EDINBURGH: 64, PRINCES-STREET.

WEST END BRANCH: 8, WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL MALL.

PELICAN LIFE INSURANCE OFFICE.

Established in 1797.

No. 70, Lombard-street E.C., and 57, Charing-cross, S.W.

DIRECTORS.

Octavius E. Coope, Esq. } Henry Lancelot Holland, Esq.
William Cotton, Esq., D.C.L., F.R.S. } William James Lancaster, Esq.
John Davis, Esq. } John Lubbock, Esq., F.R.S.
James A. Gordon, Esq., M.D., F.R.S. } Benjamin Shaw, Esq.
Edward Hawkins, jun., Esq. } Matthew Whiting, Esq.
Kirkman D. Hodgson, Esq., M.P. } Marmaduke Wyvill, jun., Esq., M.P.

ROBERT TUCKER, Secretary and Actuary.

EXAMPLES of the amount of Bonus awarded at the recent division of profits to Policies of £1,000 each, effected for the whole term of life at the under-mentioned ages:—

| Age when Assured. | Duration of Policy. | Bonus in Cash. | Bonus in Reversion. |
|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 20 | 7 years | £. s. d. 29 7 0 | £. s. d. 66 0 0 |
| | 14 years | 36 2 0 | 73 10 0 |
| | 21 years | 44 8 0 | 82 0 0 |
| 40 | 7 years | 49 13 6 | 84 10 0 |
| | 14 years | 61 2 0 | 95 10 0 |
| | 21 years | 75 2 6 | 108 0 0 |
| 60 | 7 years | 95 4 6 | 127 10 0 |
| | 14 years | 117 3 6 | 144 10 0 |
| | 21 years | 144 1 0 | 165 10 0 |

*. For Prospectuses, Forms of Proposal, &c., apply at the Offices as above, or to any of the Company's Agents.

SEVEN PER CENT. PERPETUAL PREFERENCE STOCK of the

DEMERRA RAILWAY COMPANY,

Incorporated by Act of the Colonial Legislature, and confirmed by Her Majesty in Council.

Applications for the remaining portion of this Stock may be sent to CHARLES CAVE, Esq., Colonial Commissioner, at the Banking-house of Messrs. PRESCOTT, GROTE, CAVE, & CAVE, 62, Threadneedle-street, London.

KEATING'S NEWFOUNDLAND COD LIVER OIL is distinguished by Testimonials from eminent Physicians, among whom are the following:—Professor TAYLOR, M.D., &c. &c.; Dr. SCOTT, M.D., L.R.C.P., F.L.S., &c.; Dr. EDWIN PAYNE, M.D., L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S. This Oil, being purely of hepatic origin, is pronounced to be of the greatest therapeutic value, in which the prescriber and patient may have the utmost confidence.

Sold in half-pint bottles, 1s. 6d., pints, 2s. 6d., quarts, 4s. 6d., and five-pint bottles, 10s. 6d., imperial measure, by THOMAS KEATING, Pharmaceutical Chemist, 79, St. Paul's Churchyard.

DINNEFORD'S PURE FLUID MAGNESIA has been during twenty-five years emphatically sanctioned by the Medical Profession, and universally accepted by the Public as the best remedy for Acidity of the Stomach, Heartburn, Headache, Gout, and Indigestion, and as a mild Aperient for delicate constitutions, more especially for Ladies and Children. It is prepared, in a state of perfect purity and of uniform strength, by DINNEFORD and CO., 172 New Bond street, London; and sold by all respectable Chemists throughout the world.

THE PATENT AMERICAN KITCHENER, with recently

Patented Improvements,
IS THE CHEAPEST AND MOST ECONOMICAL COOKING RANGE
EVER OFFERED TO THE PUBLIC.

It saves half the fuel usually consumed, cures smoky chimneys, requires no brickwork setting, is fully equipped with cooking utensils, and MAY BE SEEN IN OPERATION DAILY at

J. H. RIDDELL'S AMERICAN STOVE WAREHOUSE,
155, CHEAPSIDE, LONDON.

Illustrated Prospectuses, with Prices and Testimonials, free.